arXiv:0811.3792v1 [math.NT] 24 Nov 2008

On Ramification Filtrations and p-adic Differential Equations, II: mixed characteristic case

Liang Xiao
Department of Mathematics, Room 2-090
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
`lxiao@mit.edu`

November 24, 2008

Abstract

Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic (0, p) with possibly imperfect residue field. We prove a Hasse-Arf theorem for the arithmetic ramification filtrations [2] on G_K, except possibly in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case, or $p = 2$ and logarithmic case. As an application, we obtain a Hasse-Arf theorem for filtrations on finite flat group schemes over $\mathcal{O}_K$ [1, 11].

Contents

0 Introduction **2**
- 0.1 Main results . . . 2
- 0.2 Idea of the proof . . . 3
- 0.3 Who cares about the imperfect residue field case, anyway? . . . 4
- 0.4 Structure of the paper . . . 4
- 0.5 Acknowledgments . . . 4

1 Background Reviews **5**
- 1.1 Differential modules . . . 5
- 1.2 Ramification filtrations . . . 9

2 Construction of Spaces **12**
- 2.1 Standard Abbes-Saito spaces . . . 12
- 2.2 The ψ-function and thickening spaces . . . 13
- 2.3 $AS = TS$ theorem . . . 17
- 2.4 Étaleness of the thickening spaces . . . 20
- 2.5 Construction of differential modules . . . 21
- 2.6 Recursive thickening spaces . . . 22

3 Hasse-Arf Theorems **26**
3.1 Generic p-th roots 26
3.2 Base change for generic p-th roots 28
3.3 Non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem 32
3.4 Application to finite flat group schemes 33
3.5 Integrality for Swan conductors 34
3.6 An example of wildly ramified base change 37
3.7 Subquotients of logarithmic ramification filtration 41

0 Introduction

0.1 Main results

This paper is a sequel to [21], in which we proved a comparison theorem between the arithmetic ramification conductors defined by Abbes and Saito [2] and the differential ramification conductors defined by Kedlaya [17]. In that paper, a key consequence is that one can carry the Hasse-Arf theorem for the differential conductors to obtain a Hasse-Arf theorem for the arithmetic conductors in the equal characteristic $p > 0$ case.

In this paper, we will combine the ideas in [17, 21] with the techniques of nonarchimedean differential modules in [18], to give a proof of the following Hasse-Arf theorem for the arithmetic ramification conductors in the mixed characteristic case.

Theorem. *Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ and let G_K be its absolute Galois group.*

1. *(Hasse-Arf Theorem) Let $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ be a continuous representation of finite local monodromy, where V_ρ is a finite dimensional vector space over a field of characteristic zero. Then the Artin conductor $\mathrm{Art}(\rho) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ if K is not absolutely unramified; the Swan conductor $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ if $p > 2$ and $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ if $p = 2$;*

2. *The subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K / \mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_K$ for $a > 1$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K / \mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log} G_K$ for $a > 0$ of the ramification filtrations are trivial if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and are abelian groups killed by p if $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, except in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case.*

This theorem summarizes the results from Theorems 3.3.5, 3.5.11, and 3.7.3.

We do not know if $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ may fail to be an integer when $p = 2$ in general.

This question of the theorem is first raised in [3], in which Abbes and Saito proved that the subquotients of the filtrations are abelian groups, except in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case. After that, Hattori [10, 11] gave some partial results on the first part of the theorem when the corresponding field extension can be realized by a commutative finite flat group scheme. In personal correspondence, Saito told the author that he had a proof of the second part of the theorem for logarithmic ramification filtrations.

The technique used in this paper is very different from the approaches above; it only uses a small technical lemma (see Subsection 2.4) from [3]. Moreover, this paper shares some core ideas with the foregoing paper [21], but it is logically independent of that paper.

0.2 Idea of the proof

We start with a naïve approach to the above theorem in the non-logarithmic case. One easily reduces to the following case.

Let L/K be a finite totally ramified and wildly ramified extension of complete discretely valued fields of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$. Let $\mathcal{O}_K$, π_K, and k denote the ring of integers, a uniformizer, and the residue field, respectively. Assume that $\dim_{k^p} k < +\infty$. There are elements $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m \in k$ such that $\bar{b}_1^{i_1} \cdots \bar{b}_m^{i_m}$ for $i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, form a basis of k as a k^p-vector space; let $b_1, \dots, b_m$ be lifts of $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m$ in $\mathcal{O}_K$.

Pretend for a moment that we have a continuous homomorphism $\psi : \mathcal{O}_K \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0, \dots, \delta_m]\!]$ such that $\psi(\pi_K) = \pi_K + \delta_0$, and $\psi(b_i) = b_i + \delta_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. We define the rigid analytic space, called the thickening space, to be

$$TS^a_{L/K} = \mathrm{Spm}\big(L \times_{K,\psi} K\langle \pi_K^{-a}\delta_0, \dots, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_m\rangle\big) \xrightarrow{\Pi} A_K^{m+1}[0, |\pi_K|^a],$$

where Π is the projection to the second factor and $A_K^{m+1}[0, |\pi_K|^a]$ denote a (closed) polydisc of radius $|\pi_K|^a$. Since Π is finite and étale, similarly to [21, Theorem 3.4.5], we can relate the ramification breaks of L/K to the spectral norms (or equivalently, generic radii of convergence) on the differential module $\Pi_* \mathcal{O}_{TS^a_{L/K}}$ on $A_K^{m+1}[0, |\pi_K|^a]$. Using this, we would be able to prove that the ramification break is invariant under the operation of adding a generic p^∞-th root (see [21, Section 5.2]). Then we may reduce to the case when the residue field extension is separable. The non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem follows from the classical one immediately. Moreover, one can deduce the logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem from this as follows: when $\partial/\partial\delta_0$ is log-dominant the logarithmic ramification break is 1 bigger than the non-logarithmic ramification break, and when $\partial/\partial\delta_0$ is not log-dominant, the logarithmic ramification break is the same as the non-logarithmic ramification break after a tame base change of large degree. One can also prove the results for subquotients of the logarithmic ramification filtration using a trick similar to [17, Proposition 2.7.11].

Unfortunately, this proof fails because the desired homomorphism ψ *never* exists, as we cannot make $\psi(p) = p$ and $\psi(\pi_K) = \pi_K + \delta_0$ happen at the same time. As a salvage, we take ψ to be a function, which becomes a homomorphism if we modulo the ideal $I_K = p(\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_m)$ (Proposition 2.2.5). When K is absolutely unramified or, in other words, $v_K(p) = 1$, this condition is significantly weakened. This is the only hindrance to extend our main result to the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case (see also Remark 2.2.6).

We define the space $TS^a_{L/K,\psi}$ by writing down the equations generating $\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K$ and applying ψ termwise. When considering the effect of adding a generic p-th root (instead of p^∞-th root, see Remark 3.2.6), we have to carefully keep track of the error terms due to ψ.

Another key ingredient is the amazing fact proved in [2, Theorem 7.2] (and [3, Corollary 4.12] in the logarithmic case) that $TS^a_{L/K,\psi}$ is finite and *étale* over $A_K^{m+1}[0, |\pi_K|^a]$ if $a \geq b(L/K) - \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, where $b(L/K)$ is the highest ramification break of L/K. This étaleness statement validates the construction of differential modules. The auxiliary étale locus given by ϵ enables us to find the exact loci where the intrinsic radii are maximal, and hence to identify the ramification break.

Also, since ψ fails to be a homomorphism, we have to study the generic radii of convergence over polydiscs instead of one dimensional discs; this makes essential use of the recent results on p-adic differential modules from [18]. As a result, the proof of the logarithmic case is slightly more complicated and for $p = 2$, we can only prove that Swan conductors lie in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ instead of in $\mathbb{Z}$.

0.3 Who cares about the imperfect residue field case, anyway?

The imperfect residue field plays an important role in algebraic geometry when measuring the ramification along a divisor. For instance, passing to the completion at the generic points of divisors often results in one working over complete discrete valuation rings with imperfect residue fields.

Kedlaya [15] started an interesting study along this line, inspired by the semicontinuity results of André [4] in complex algebraic geometry. In [15], Kedlaya took an F-isocrystal on a smooth surface X overconvergent along the complement divisor D of simple normal crossings, in a compactification of X. If we blow up the intersection of two irreducible components of D, we may realize $\mathcal{F}$ over this new space and measure the Swan conductor along the exceptional divisor. This process can be iterated. Kedlaya proved in [15] that, after suitable normalization, the Swan conductors along these exceptional divisors are interpolated by a continuous piecewise linear convex function. This result was stated for general smooth varieties of arbitrary dimension in [15].

An interesting question is: does the same phenomenon happen for a noetherian complete regular local ring $\mathcal{O}_K[\![t_1, \dots, t_n]\!]$, where $\mathcal{O}_K$ is a complete discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic?

Another application is to the study of finite flat group schemes via ramification filtration initiated by Abbes and Mokrane in [1]. Hattori conjectured that one can give a bound on the denominators of ramification breaks. This can be proved by an analogous Hasse-Arf theorem for finite flat group schemes. Thus, as a consequence of the main theorem of this paper, we obtain a Hasse-Arf theorem for finite flat group schemes in the mixed characteristic case by an argument originally due to Hattori.

0.4 Structure of the paper

In Section 1, we first recall some results of differential modules from [18]. Then we review the definition of ramification filtrations in Subsection 1.2.

In Section 2, we set up the framework for the proof of the main result. In Subsection 2.1, we introduce the standard Abbes-Saito spaces. In Subsections 2.2-2.5, we define the function ψ we mentioned earlier and construct the thickening spaces and the associated differential modules; the aim is to translate the question about the ramification breaks into a question about the intrinsic radii of convergence. In Subsection 2.6, we discuss a variant of thickening spaces.

The proofs of the main Theorems 3.3.5, 3.5.11, and 3.7.3 occupy the whole Section 3. In the first three subsections, we deduce the Hasse-Arf theorem for non-logarithmic ramification filtration. In Subsection 3.4, we apply the Hasse-Arf theorem for Artin conductors to obtain a Hasse-Arf theorem for finite flat group schemes. In Subsection 3.5, we deduce the integrality of Swan conductors from that of Artin conductors by tame base change. In the last two subsections, we use a trick of Kedlaya to prove that the subquotients of the logarithmic filtration (on the wild ramification group) are elementary p-abelian groups.

0.5 Acknowledgments

Many thanks are due to my advisor, Kiran Kedlaya, for introducing me to the problem, for generating some crucial ideas, for answering my stupid questions, and for spending many hours reviewing early drafts.

Thanks to Jennifer Balakrishnan for helping me review early drafts, correct the grammar, and smooth the argument. Thanks also to Ahmed Abbes, Shin Hattori, Ruochuan Liu, Shun Ohkubo, Andrea Pulita, Takeshi Saito, Yichao Tian, and Xin Zhou for helpful discussions. The author would also like to express his special thank to Ahmed Abbes and Takeshi Saito for organizing the wonderful conference *On Vanishing Cycles* in Japan in 2007. It provided the author a great opportunity to learn about this field.

Financial support was provided by MIT Department of Mathematics. Also, when working on this paper, The author had Research Assistantship funded by Kedlaya's NSF CAREER grant DMS-0545904.

1 Background Reviews

1.1 Differential modules

We first recall some recent results in the theory of p-adic differential modules. This subject was first studied by Christol, Dwork, Mebkhout, and Robba [7, 8, 9]. Recently, Kedlaya and the author improved some of the techniques in [14, 18]. We record some useful results from these sources.

Convention 1.1.1. Throughout this paper, $p > 0$ will be a prime number. By a *nonarchimedean field*, we mean a field K of characteristic zero and complete with respect to a nonarchimedean norm for which $|p| = 1/p$. In particular, the residue field of K has characteristic p.

Convention 1.1.2. For an index set J, we write e_J or (e_J) for a tuple $(e_j)_{j \in J}$. For another tuple b_J, denote $b_J^{e_J} = \prod_{j \in J} b_j^{e_j}$ if only finitely many $e_j \neq 0$. We also use $\sum_{e_J=0}^{n}$ to mean the sum over $e_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ for each $j \in J$, only allowing finitely many of them to be nonzero. For notational simplicity, we may suppress the range of the summation when it is clear. For a set A, we write $e_J \subset A$ or $(e_J) \subset A$ to mean that $e_j \in A$ for all $j \in J$.

Notation 1.1.3. From now on, let K be a nonarchimedean field and fix an element $\pi_K \in K^\times$ of norm $\theta < 1$. When K is a complete discretely valued field, we take π_K to be a uniformizer.

Notation 1.1.4. For an interval $I \subset [0, +\infty]$, we denote the n-dimensional polyannulus with radii in I by $A_K^n(I)$. (We do not impose any rationality condition on the endpoints of I, so this space should be viewed as an analytic space in the sense of Berkovich [5].) If I is written explicitly in terms of its endpoints (e.g., $[\alpha, \beta]$), we suppress the parentheses around I (e.g., $A_K^n[\alpha, \beta]$).

Notation 1.1.5. Let R be a complete topological ring. We use $R\langle u_1, \dots, u_m\rangle$ to denote the completion of the polynomial ring $R[u_1, \dots, u_m]$ with respect to the topology induced from R. When R is an complete $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra, we write $R\langle \pi_K^{-a_1}\delta_1, \dots, \pi_K^{-a_m}\delta_m\rangle$ to denote the formal substitution of $R\langle u_1, \dots, u_m\rangle$ via $u_j = \pi_K^{-a_j}\delta_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, where $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $K\langle \pi_K^{-a_1}\delta_1, \dots, \pi_K^{-a_m}\delta_m\rangle$ is the ring of analytic functions on $A_K^1[0, \theta^{a_1}] \times \cdots \times A_K^1[0, \theta^{a_m}]$.

We use $K[\![T]\!]_0$ to denote the bounded power series ring consisting of formal power series $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} a_i T^i$ for which $a_i \in K$ and $|a_i|$ are bounded.

Notation 1.1.6. In this subsection, let $J = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $J^+ = J \cup \{0\}$.

Definition 1.1.7. For $s_{J^+} \in \mathbb{R}$, the $\theta^{s_{J^+}}$-*Gauss norm* on $K[\delta_{J^+}]$ is the norm given by

$$\Big|\sum_{e_{J^+}} a_{e_{J^+}} \delta_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}}\Big|_{s_{J^+}} = \max\big\{|a_{e_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{e_0 s_0 + \cdots + e_m s_m}\big\}.$$

It extends uniquely to $K(\delta_{J^+})$; denote the completion by $F_{s_{J^+}}$. This Gauss norm also extends continuously to $K\langle\pi_K^{-a_0}\delta_0,\dots,\pi_K^{-a_m}\delta_m\rangle$ if $s_j\in[a_j,+\infty)$ for all $j\in J^+$, and $K\langle\pi_K^{-a_0}\delta_0,\dots,\pi_K^{-a_m}\delta_m\rangle$ embeds into $F_{s_{J^+}}$.

Convention 1.1.8. Throughout this paper, all (relative) differentials and derivations are continuous and all connections are integrable. For notational simplicity, we may suppress the continuity and integrability.

Definition 1.1.9. Let F be a differential field of order 1 and characteristic zero, i.e., a field of characteristic zero equipped with a derivation ∂. Assume that F is complete for a nonarchimedean norm $|\cdot|$. Let V be a differential module with the differential operator ∂. The *spectral norm of ∂ on V* is defined to be

$$|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},V}=\lim_{n\to+\infty}|\partial^n|_V^{1/n}.$$

One can show that $|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},V}\geq|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},F}$ [14, Lemma 6.2.4].

Define the *intrinsic ∂-radius* of V to be

$$IR_\partial(V)=|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},F}/|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},V}\in(0,1].$$

Example 1.1.10. For $a_{J^+}\subset\mathbb{R}$, the spectral norms of ∂_{J^+} on $F_{s_{J^+}}$ are as follows.

$$|\partial_j|_{F_{s_{J^+}},\mathrm{sp}}=p^{-1/(p-1)}\theta^{-a_j},\quad j\in J^+.$$

Remark 1.1.11. If F'/F is a complete extension and ∂ extends to F'. Then for any differential module V on F, $V\otimes F'$ is a differential module on F'. Moreover, if $|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},F}=|\partial|_{\mathrm{sp},F'}$, we have $IR_\partial(V)=IR_\partial(V\otimes F')$.

Notation 1.1.12. Let $a_{J^+}\subset\mathbb{R}$ be a tuple and let $X=A_K^1[0,\theta^{a_0}]\times\cdots\times A_K^1[0,\theta^{a_m}]$ be the closed polydisc with radii $\theta^{a_{J^+}}$ and with δ_{J^+} as coordinates.

Notation 1.1.13. A *differential module* over X (relative to K) is a finite locally free coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ on X together with an integrable connection

$$\nabla:\mathcal{E}\to\mathcal{E}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}\Big(\bigoplus_{j\in J^+}\mathcal{O}_X\cdot d\delta_j\Big).$$

Let $\partial_{J^+}=\partial/\partial\delta_{J^+}$ be the dual basis of $d\delta_{J^+}$. They act commutatively on $\mathcal{E}$. A section $\mathbf{v}$ of $\mathcal{E}$ over X is called *horizontal* if $\partial_j(\mathbf{v})=0$ for $\forall j\in J^+$. Let $H^0_\nabla(X,\mathcal{E})$ denote all horizontal sections on $\mathcal{E}$ over X. A differential module is called *trivial* if there exists a set of horizontal sections which forms a basis of $\mathcal{E}$ as a free coherent sheaf.

Let $s_j\in[a_j,+\infty)$ for $j\in J^+$. For $j\in J^+$, let $IR_j(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})$ denote the intrinsic ∂_j-radius $IR_{\partial_j}(\mathcal{E}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}F_{s_{J^+}})$. Let $IR(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})=\min_{j\in J^+}\{IR_j(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})\}$ be the *intrinsic radius* of $\mathcal{E}$. If $s_{j'}=s$ for all $j'\in J$, we simply write $IR_j(\mathcal{E};s_0,\underline{s})$ and $IR(\mathcal{E};s_0,\underline{s})$ for intrinsic ∂_j-radius and intrinsic radius, respectively. Moreover, if $s_0=s$, we may further simplify the notation as $IR_j(\mathcal{E};\underline{s})$ and $IR(\mathcal{E};\underline{s})$.

Lemma 1.1.14. *Fix $j\in J^+$. There exists a unique continuous K-homomorphism $f^*_{\mathrm{gen},j}:F_{a_{J^+}}\to F_{a_{J^+}}[\![\pi_K^{-a_j}T_j]\!]_0$, such that $f^*_{\mathrm{gen},j}(\delta_{J^+\setminus\{j\}})=\delta_{J^+\setminus\{j\}}$ and $f^*_{\mathrm{gen},j}(\delta_j)=\delta_j+T_j$.*

Proof. See [18, Lemma 1.2.12]. $\square$

Lemma 1.1.15. *Denote $F = F_{a_{J+}}$ for short. The pullback $f^*_{\mathrm{gen},j}(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} F)$ becomes a differential module over $A^1_F[0, \theta^{a_j})$ relative to F. Then for any $r \in [0,1]$, $IR_j(\mathcal{E}; a_{J+}) \geq r$ if and only if $f^*_{\mathrm{gen},j}(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} F)$ is trivial over $A^1_F[0, r\theta^{a_j})$.*

Proof. This is essentially because the Taylor series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial^n_{T_j}(\mathbf{v}) \cdot T_j^n/(n!) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial^n_j(\mathbf{v}) \cdot T_j^n/(n!)$ converges when $|T_j| < r\theta^{a_j}$ for any section $\mathbf{v}$ if and only if $IR_j(\mathcal{E}; a_{J+}) \geq r$. For more details, see [18, Proposition 1.2.14]. $\square$

We reproduce some basic properties of intrinsic radii, starting with the following off-centered tame base change, which is a fun exercise in [14, Chap. 9, Exercise 8]. To ease the readers who are not familiar with differential modules, we give a complete proof.

Construction 1.1.16. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ prime to p. Assume for a moment that $m = 0$, i.e., we consider the one dimensional case $X = A^1_K[0, \theta^a]$. Fix $x_0 \in K$ such that $|x_0| = \theta^b > \theta^a$ ($b < a$). In particular, the point $\delta_0 = -x_0$ is not in the disc X. Denote $K_n = K(x_0^{1/n})$, where we fix an n-th root $x_0^{1/n}$ of x_0.

Consider the K-homomorphism $f_n^* : K\langle \pi_K^{-a} \delta_0 \rangle \to K_n \langle \pi_K^{-a+b(n-1)/n} \eta_0 \rangle$, sending δ_0 to

$$(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^n - x_0 = x_0^{(n-1)/n} \eta_0 \Big(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i+1} \big(\frac{\eta_0}{x_0^{1/n}}\big)^i \Big),$$

where the term in the bracket on the right has norm 1 and invertible because $|x_0^{1/n}| > |\eta_0|$. Hence f_n^* extends continuously to a homomorphism $F_a \to F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}$, where $F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}$ is the completion of $K_n(\eta_0)$ with respect to the $\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n}$-Gauss norm.

Also, f_n^* gives a morphism of rigid K-spaces $f_n : Z = A^1_{K_n}[0, \theta^{a-b(n-1)/n}] \to X = A^1_K[0, \theta^a]$. It is finite and étale because the branching locus is at $\delta_0 = -x_0$, outside the disc X. Thus, for a differential module $\mathcal{E}$ on X, its pull back $f_n^*\mathcal{E}$ is a differential module over Z via

$$f_n^* \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{f_n^* \nabla} f_n^* \Big(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X d\delta_0 \Big) \longrightarrow f_n^* \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \mathcal{O}_Z d\eta_0,$$

where the last homomorphism is given by $d\delta_0 \mapsto n(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^{n-1} d\eta_0$.

Proposition 1.1.17. *Keep the notation as above. We have*

$$IR_{\partial_{\eta_0}}(f_n^* \mathcal{E}; a - b(n-1)/n) = IR_{\partial_0}(\mathcal{E}; a).$$

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as [16, Lemma 5.11] or [14, Proposition 9.7.6]. Lemma 1.1.14 gives the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F_a \arrow[r, "f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}"] \arrow[d, "f_n^*"] & F_a[\![\pi_K^{-a} T_0]\!]_0 \arrow[d, "\tilde{f}_n^*"] \\
F'_{a-b(n-1)/n} \arrow[r, "f'^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}"] & F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}[\![\pi_K^{-a+b(n-1)/n} T'_0]\!]_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{f}_n^*$ extends f_n^* by sending T_0 to $(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0 + T'_0)^n - (x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^n$.

We claim that for $r \in [0, 1]$, $\tilde{f}_n$ induces an isomorphism between

$$F'_{a-b(n-1)/n} \times_{f_n^*, F_a} \left(A^1_{F_a}[0, r\theta^a)\right) \cong A^1_{F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}}[0, r\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n}).$$

Indeed, if $|T'_0| < r\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n} < \theta^{b/n}$, then

$$|T_0| = |(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0 + T'_0)^n - (x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^n| = |nT'_0(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^{n-1}| < r\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n} \cdot (\theta^{b/n})^{n-1} = r\theta^a.$$

Conversely, if $|T_0| < r\theta^a$, we define the inverse map by the binomial series

$$T'_0 = (x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0) \cdot \Big[-1 + \Big(1 + \frac{T_0}{(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^n}\Big)^{1/n} \Big] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \binom{1/n}{i} \frac{T_0^i}{(x_0^{1/n} + \eta_0)^{ni-1}}.$$

The series converges to an element with norm $< r\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n}$.

Therefore, Lemma 1.1.15 implies that for $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& IR_{\partial_0}(\mathcal{E}; a) \geq r \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} F_a) \text{ is trivial over } A^1_{F_a}[0, r\theta^a) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \tilde{f}_n^* f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} F_a) = f'^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}\big(f_n^*\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z} F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}\big) \text{ is trivial over } A^1_{F'_{a-b(n-1)/n}}[0, r\theta^{a-b(n-1)/n}) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & IR_{\partial_{\eta_0}}(f_n^*\mathcal{E}; a - b(n-1)/n) \geq r.
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition follows. ☐

Similarly, we can study a type of off-centered Frobenius.

Construction 1.1.18. Let $b > 0$ and $0 < a < \min\{-\log_\theta p + b, pb\}$ and let $\beta \in K$ be an element of norm 1. Let L be the completion of $K(x)$ with respect to the θ^a-Gauss norm.

Let $f : Z = A^1_L[0, \theta^b] \to A^1_K[0, \theta^a]$ be the morphism given by $f^* : \delta_0 \mapsto (\beta + \eta_0)^p - \beta^p + x$. By our choices of a and b, the leading term of $f^*(\delta_0)$ is x, which is transcendental over K. Hence f^* extends continuously to a homomorphism $F_a \to F'_b$, where F'_b is the completion of $L(\eta_0)$ with respect to the θ^b-Gauss norm. Moreover, $f^*\Omega^1_X \cong \Omega^1_Z$ as the branching locus is at $\eta_0 = -\beta$, outside the disc. Thus $f^*\mathcal{E}$ becomes a differential module over $Z = A^1_L[0, \theta^b]$ via

$$f^*\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{f^*\nabla} f^*\Big(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X d\delta_0\Big) \longrightarrow f^*\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \mathcal{O}_Z d\eta_0,$$

where the second homomorphism is given by $d\delta_0 \mapsto p(\beta + \eta_0)^{p-1} d\eta_0$.

Proposition 1.1.19. *Keep the notation as above. We have*

$$IR_{\partial_0}(f^*\mathcal{E}; b) \geq IR_{\partial_{\eta_0}}(\mathcal{E}; a).$$

Proof. As in Proposition 1.1.17, we start with the following commutative diagram from Lemma 1.1.14.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F_a \arrow[r, "f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}"] \arrow[d, "f^*"] & F_a[\![\pi_K^{-a} T_0]\!]_0 \arrow[d, "\tilde{f}^*"] \\
F'_b \arrow[r, "f'^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}"] & F'_b[\![\pi_K^{-b} T'_0]\!]_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{f}^*$ extends f^* by sending T_0 to $(\beta+\eta_0+T_0')^p-(\beta+\eta_0)^p$.

For $r\in[0,1]$, by Lemma 1.1.20 below, $|T_0'|<r\theta^a$ implies $|T_0|<\max\{r^p\theta^{pa},p^{-1}r\theta^a\}<r\theta^b$. Therefore, Lemma 1.1.15 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&IR_{\partial_0}(\mathcal{E};a)\geq r\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}(\mathcal{E}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}F_a)\text{ is trivial over }A^1_{F_a}[0,r\theta^a)\\
\Rightarrow\quad & \tilde{f}^*f^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}(\mathcal{E}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}F_a)=f'^*_{\mathrm{gen},0}(f^*\mathcal{E}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z}F_b')\text{ is trivial over }A^1_{F_b'}[0,r\theta^b)\\
\Leftrightarrow\quad & IR_{\partial_{\eta_0}}(f^*\mathcal{E};b)\geq r.
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition follows. □

Lemma 1.1.20. [14, Lemma 10.2.2(a)] *Let K be a non-archimedean field and let $b,T\in K$. For $r\in(0,1)$, if $|b-T|<r|b|$, then*

$$|b^p-T^p|\leq\max\{r^p|b|^p,p^{-1}r|b|^p\}.$$

Remark 1.1.21. A stronger form of Proposition 1.1.19 above for (straight) Frobenius can be found in [14, Lemma 10.3.2] or [18, Lemma 1.4.11].

Now, we study the variation of intrinsic radii on the polydisc.

Definition 1.1.22. An *affine functional* on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ is a function $\lambda:\mathbb{R}^{m+1}\to\mathbb{R}$ of the form $\lambda(x_0,\dots,x_m)=a_0x_0+\cdots+a_mx_m+b$ for some $a_0,\dots,a_m,b\in\mathbb{R}$. If $a_0,\dots,a_m\in\mathbb{Z}$, we say λ is *transintegral* (short for "integral after translation").

A subset $C\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ is *polyhedral* if there exist finitely many affine functionals $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r$ such that

$$C=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^{m+1}:\lambda_i(x)\geq 0\qquad(i=1,\dots,r)\}.$$

If the λ_i can be all taken to be transintegral, we say that C is *transrational polyhedral.*

Proposition 1.1.23. *Let $a_{J^+}\subset\mathbb{R}$ be a tuple and let $X=A^1_K[0,\theta^{a_0}]\times\cdots\times A^1_K[0,\theta^{a_m}]$ be the polydisc with radii a_{J^+} and coordinates δ_{J^+}. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a differential module over X. Then*

(a) (Continuity) The function $-\log_\theta IR(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})$ is continuous for $s_j\in[a_j,+\infty)$ and $j\in J^+$.

(b) (Monotonicity) Let $s_j\geq s_j'\geq a_j$ for all $j\in J^+$. Then $IR(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})\geq IR(\mathcal{E};s'_{J^+})$.

(c) (Zero Loci) The subset $Z(\mathcal{E})=\{s_{J^+}\in[a_0,+\infty)\times\cdots\times[a_m,+\infty)|IR(\mathcal{E};s_{J^+})=1\}$ is transrational polyhedral.

Proof. Statements (a) and (c) follow from [18, Theorem 3.3.9]. For (b), by drawing zig-zag lines parallel to axes linking the two points s_{J^+} and s'_{J^+}, it suffices to consider the case when $s_j=s_j'$ for $j\in J^+\backslash\{j_0\}$ and $s_{j_0}\geq s'_{j_0}$. In this case, we may base change to the completion of $K(\delta_{J^+\backslash\{j_0\}})$ with respect to the $s_{J^+\backslash\{j_0\}}$-Gauss norm. The result follows from [18, Theorem 2.4.4(c)]. □

1.2 Ramification filtrations

In this subsection, We sketch Abbes and Saito's definition of the ramification filtrations on the Galois group G_K of a complete discretely valued field K of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$. For more details, one can consult [2] and [3].

In this subsection, we drop Notation 1.1.6.

Convention 1.2.1. For any complete discretely valued field K of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$, we denote its ring of integers and residue field by $\mathcal{O}_K$ and k, respectively. Let π_K denote a uniformizer and $\mathfrak{m}_K$ denote the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_K$ (generated by π_K). We normalize the valuation $v_K(\cdot)$ on K so that $v_K(\pi_K) = 1$; the *absolute ramification degree* is defined to be $\beta_K = v_K(p)$. We say that K is *absolutely unramified* if $\beta_K = 1$. For an element $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we write its reduction in k as $\bar{a}$; a is called a *lift* of $\bar{a}$.

We choose and fix an algebraic closure K^{alg} of K. Let G_K denote the absolute Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K^{\mathrm{alg}}/K)$. If L is a finite Galois extension of K, we denote the Galois group by $G_{L/K}$. We use $\mathbf{N}_{L/K}(x)$ to denote the norm of an element $x \in L$. If L is a (not necessarily algebraic) complete extension of K and is itself a discretely valued field, we use $e_{L/K}$ to denote its *naïve ramification degree*, i.e., the value group of K in that of L. We say that L/K is tamely ramified if $p \nmid e$ and the residue field extension κ_L/κ_K is *algebraic* and separable. If moreover $e = 1$, we say that L/K is unramified.

Notation 1.2.2. From now on, K will be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$, and L will be a finite Galois extension of K of naïve ramification degree $e = e_{L/K}$. Set $\theta = |\pi_K|$; this matches the convention in the previous subsection.

Definition 1.2.3. Take $Z = (z_j)_{j\in J} \subset \mathcal{O}_L$ to be a finite set of elements generating $\mathcal{O}_L$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$, i.e., $\mathcal{O}_K[u_J]/\mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_L$ mapping u_j to z_j for all $j \in J = \{1, \dots, m\}$. Let $(f_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ be a finite set of generators of $\mathcal{I}$. For $a > 0$, define the *Abbes-Saito space* to be

$$AS^a_{L/K,Z} = \big\{(u_1, \dots, u_m) \in A^m_K[0, 1] \bigm| |f_i(u_J)| \leq \theta^a, 1 \leq i \leq n\big\}.$$

If $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, we denote the set of *geometrically* connected components of $AS^a_{L/K,Z}$ by $\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(AS^a_{L/K,Z})$. The *highest ramification break* $b(L/K)$ of the extension L/K is defined to be the minimal $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any rational number $a > b$, $\#\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(AS^a_{L/K,Z}) = [L : K]$.

Definition 1.2.4. Keep the notation as above. Take a subset $P \subset Z$ and assume that P and hence Z contain π_L. Let $e_j = v_L(z_j)$, $z_j \in P$. Take a lift $g_j \in \mathcal{O}_K[u_J]$ of $z_j^e/\pi_K^{e_j}$ for each $z_j \in P$; take a lift $h_{i,j} \in \mathcal{O}_K[u_J]$ of $z_j^{e_i}/z_i^{e_j}$ for each pair $(z_i, z_j) \in P \times P$. For $a > 0$, define the *logarithmic Abbes-Saito space* to be

$$AS^a_{L/K,\log,Z,P} = \left\{ (u_J) \in A^m_K[0,1] \left| \begin{array}{cc} |f_i(u_J)| \leq \theta^a, & 1 \leq i \leq n \\ |u_j^e - \pi_K^{e_j} g_j| \leq \theta^{a+e_j} & \text{for all } z_j \in P \\ |u_j^{e_i} - u_i^{e_j} h_{i,j}| \leq \theta^{a+e_ie_j/e} & \text{for all } (z_i, z_j) \in P \times P \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Similarly, the *highest logarithmic ramification break* $b_{\log}(L/K)$ of the extension L/K is defined to be the minimal $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any rational number $a > b$, $\#\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(AS^a_{L/K,\log,Z,P}) = [L : K]$.

We reproduce several statements from [2] and [3].

Proposition 1.2.5. *The Abbes-Saito spaces have the following properties.*

(1) *The Abbes-Saito spaces* $AS^a_{L/K,Z}$ *and* $AS^a_{L/K,\log,Z,P}$ *do not depend on the choices of the generators* $(f_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ *of* $\mathcal{I}$ *and the lifts* g_j *and* $h_{i,j}$ *for* $i, j \in P$ [2, Section 3].

(1') *If in the definition of both Abbes-Saito spaces, we choose polynomials* $(f_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ *as generators of* $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_J\rangle \to \mathcal{O}_L)$ *instead of* $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\mathcal{O}_K[u_J] \to \mathcal{O}_L)$*, the spaces do not change.*

(2) *If we substitute another pair of generating sets Z and P satisfying the same properties, then the geometrically connected components $\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(AS^a_{L/K,Z})$ and $\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(AS^a_{L/K,\log,Z,P})$ do not change. In particular, both highest ramification breaks are well-defined* [2, Section 3].

(3) *The highest ramification break (resp. highest logarithmic ramification break) gives rise to a filtration on the Galois group G_K consisting of normal subgroups $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K$ (resp., $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K$)* [2, Theorem 3.3, 3.11]. *Moreover, for L/K a finite Galois extension, both highest ramification breaks are rational numbers* [2, Theorem 3.8, 3.16].

(4) *Let K'/K be a (not necessarily finite) extension of complete discretely valued fields. If K'/K is unramified, then $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_{K'} = \mathrm{Fil}^a G_K$* [2, Proposition 3.7]. *If K'/K is tamely ramified with ramification index $e < \infty$, then $\mathrm{Fil}^{ea}_{\log} G_{K'} = \mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K$* [2, Proposition 3.15].

(4') *More generally, let L/K be a finite algebraic extension and let K'/K be a complete extension of discretely valued fields with the* same *valued group and linearly independent of L. Denote $L' = K'K$. If $\mathcal{O}_{L'} = \mathcal{O}_L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K'}$, then* $b(L/K) = b(L'/K')$ [1, Lemme 2.1.5].

(5) *Define $\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_K = \cup_{b>a} \mathrm{Fil}^b G_K$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log} G_K = \cup_{b>a} \mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log} G_K$. Then, the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_K$ are abelian p-groups if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>1}$ and are 0 if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$, except when K is absolutely unramified* ([2, Theorem 3.8] and [3, Theorem 1]). *The subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log} G_K$ are abelian p-groups if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and are 0 if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$* ([2, Theorem 3.16], [3, Theorem 1]).

(6) *For $a > 0$, $\mathrm{Fil}^{a+1} G_K \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^a G_K$* [2, Theorem 3.15(1)].

(7) *The inertia subgroup is* $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K$ *for $a \in (0, 1]$ and the wild inertia subgroup is* $\mathrm{Fil}^{1+} G_K = \mathrm{Fil}^{0+}_{\log} G_K$ [2, Theorems 3.7 and 3.15].

(8) *When the residue field k is perfect, the arithmetic ramification filtrations agree with the classical upper numbered filtration* [19] *in the following way: $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K = \mathrm{Fil}^{a-1}_{\log} G_K = G^a_K$ for $a \geq 1$, where G^a_K is the classical upper numbered filtration on G_K* [2, Section 6.1].

Proof. Only (1') is not proved in any literature. But one can prove it verbatim as (1). For a brief summary of the proofs for other statements, one may consult [21, Proposition 4.1.6]. (Although the statements there are stated for equal characteristic case, the proofs work just fine.) ☐

Remark 1.2.6. To avoid confusion, we point out that in the proof of our main theorem, we do not need (5) and the second statement of (3) on the rationality of the breaks in the proposition above. Therefore, we will prove these properties along the way of proving the main theorem.

Remark 1.2.7. In personal correspondence, T. Saito told the author that he found a proof of the fact that the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log} G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log} G_K$ are elementary p-groups for $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.

Definition 1.2.8. For $b \geq 0$, we write $\mathrm{Fil}^b G_{L/K} = (G_L \mathrm{Fil}^b G_K)/G_L$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log} G_{L/K} = (G_L \mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log} G_K)/G_L$. We call b a *non-logarithmic (resp. logarithmic) ramification break* of L/K if $\mathrm{Fil}^b G_{L/K}/\mathrm{Fil}^{b+} G_{L/K}$ (resp. $\mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log} G_{L/K}/\mathrm{Fil}^{b+}_{\log} G_{L/K}$) is non-trivial.

Definition 1.2.9. By a representation of G_K, we mean a continuous homomorphism $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$, where V_ρ is a finite dimensional vector space over a field F of characteristic zero. We allow F to have a non-archimedean topology; hence the image of G_K may not be finite. We say that ρ has *finite local monodromy* if the image of the inertia subgroup of G_K is finite.

Definition 1.2.10. For a representation $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ of G_K with finite local monodromy, define the *Artin and Swan conductors* of ρ as

$$\mathrm{Art}(\rho) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} a\cdot\dim\big(V_\rho^{\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}G_K}/V_\rho^{\mathrm{Fil}^{a}G_K}\big), \tag{1.2.10.1}$$

$$\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{a\in\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}} a\cdot\dim\big(V_\rho^{\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log}G_K}/V_\rho^{\mathrm{Fil}^{a}_{\log}G_K}\big). \tag{1.2.10.2}$$

In fact, they are finite sums.

Conjecture 1.2.11 (Hasse-Arf Theorem). *Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$ and let $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ be a representation with finite local monodromy. Then we have*

(1) $\mathrm{Art}(\rho)$ and $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ are non-negative integers, and

(2) the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^aG_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}G_K$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log}G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log}G_K$ are abelian groups killed by p.

In Theorems 3.3.5, 3.5.11, and 3.7.3, we will prove this conjecture except in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case, or the $p = 2$ and logarithmic case. When the residue field is perfect, this conjecture is well-known.

Proposition 1.2.12. *If the residue field k is perfect, Conjecture 1.2.11 holds.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.2.5(8), it follows from the classical Hasse-Arf theorem [19, § VI.2 Theorem 1]. ☐

2 Construction of Spaces

In this section, we construct a series of spaces and study their relations; in particular, we prove that the Abbes-Saito spaces are the same as thickening spaces, and translate the question on ramification breaks to the question on generic radii of differential modules.

2.1 Standard Abbes-Saito spaces

In this subsection, we introduce the standard Abbes-Saito spaces by choosing a distinguished set of generators of $\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K$.

Definition 2.1.1. For a field k of characteristic p, a *p-basis* of k is a set $\bar{b}_J \subset k$ such that $\bar{b}_J^{e_J}$, where $e_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ for all $j \in J$ and $e_j = 0$ for all but finitely many j, form a basis of k as a k^p-vector space. For a complete discretely valued field K of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$, a *p-basis* is a set of lifts $b_J \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ of a p-basis of the residue field k.

Hypothesis 2.1.2. Throughout this section, let K be a discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$ with *separably closed* and *imperfect* residue field. Assume that K admits a *finite* p-basis. Also, let L/K be a wildly ramified Galois extension of naïve ramification degree $e = e_{L/K}$. In particular, L/K is totally ramified and $b(L/K) > 1$, $b_{\log}(L/K) > 0$.

Remark 2.1.3. This is a mild hypothesis because the conductors behave well under unramified base changes, and the tamely ramified case is well-studied.

Notation 2.1.4. For the rest of the paper, we retrieve Notation 1.1.6, namely, let $J = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $J^+ = J \cup \{0\}$. We will save the notations j and m only for indexing p-bases and related variables, and $j = 0$ refers to the uniformizer.

Notation 2.1.5. We define a norm on $\mathcal{O}_K[u_{J^+}]$: for $h = \sum_{e_{J^+}} \alpha_{e_{J^+}} u_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}}$, where $\alpha_{e_{J^+}} \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we set $|h| = \max_{e_{J^+}}\{|\alpha_{e_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{e_0/e}\}$. For $a \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, denote N^a to be the set of elements with norm $\leq \theta^a$; it is in fact an ideal.

Construction 2.1.6. Choose p-bases $b_J \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ and $c_J \subset \mathcal{O}_L$ of K and L, respectively. Let $\mathbf{k}_0 = k$ with p-basis $(\bar{b}_j)_{j \in J}$. By possibly rearranging the indexing in b_J, we can filter the extension l/k by subextensions $\mathbf{k}_j = k(\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_j)$ with p-bases $\{\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_j, \bar{b}_{j+1}, \dots, \bar{b}_m\}$ for $j \in J$. Moreover, if $[\mathbf{k}_j : \mathbf{k}_{j-1}] = p^{r_j}$, then $\bar{c}_j^{p^{r_j}} \in \mathbf{k}_{j-1}$. We also choose uniformizers π_K and π_L of K and L so that $\pi_K/\pi_L^e \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_L}$.

Write $\Delta : \mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/\mathcal{I}_{L/K} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_L$ mapping u_j to c_j for $j \in J$ and u_0 to π_L, where $\mathcal{I}_{L/K}$ is some proper ideal. Let $\overline{\Delta}$ be the composite of Δ with the reduction $\mathcal{O}_L \twoheadrightarrow l$. Hence,

$$\big\{u_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} | e_j \in \{0, \dots, p^{r_j} - 1\} \text{ for all } j \in J, \text{ and } e_0 \in \{0, \dots, e-1\}\big\} \tag{2.1.6.1}$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/\mathcal{I}_{L/K}$ as a free $\mathcal{O}_K$-module. We choose a set of generators p_{J^+} of $\mathcal{I}_{L/K}$ by writing each $u_j^{p^{r_j}}$ (for $j \in J$) or u_0^e (for $j = 0$) in terms of the basis (2.1.6.1). We say that p_j *corresponds* to c_j. Obviously, p_{J^+} generates $\mathcal{I}_{L/K}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} p_j &\in u_j^{p^{r_j}} - \tilde{b}_j(u_1, \dots, u_{j-1}) + N^{1/e} \cdot \mathcal{O}_K[u_{J^+}], \quad j \in J, \\ p_0 &\in u_0^e - \pi_K + \pi_K N^{1/e} \cdot \mathcal{O}_K[u_{J^+}], \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{b}_j(u_1, \dots, u_m) \in \mathcal{O}_K[u_1, \dots, u_{j-1}]$ with powers on u_i smaller than p^{r_i} for all $i = 1, \dots, j-1$.

Definition 2.1.7. The *(standard) Abbes-Saito spaces* $AS^a_{L/K}$ for $a > 1$ and $AS^a_{L/K,\log}$ for $a > 0$ are defined by taking generators to be $\{c_J, \pi_L\}$ and relations to be p_{J^+} (see Proposition 1.2.5(1')). In particular, their rings of functions are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K} &= K\langle u_{J^+}, \pi_K^{-a} V_{J^+}\rangle / \big(p_0(u_{J^+}) - V_0, \dots, p_m(u_{J^+}) - V_m\big), \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log} &= K\langle u_{J^+}, \pi_K^{-a-1} V_0, \pi_K^{-a} V_J\rangle / \big(p_0(u_{J^+}) - V_0, \dots, p_m(u_{J^+}) - V_m\big). \end{aligned}$$

2.2 The ψ-function and thickening spaces

In this subsection, we first define a function (*not* a homomorphism) $\psi : \mathcal{O}_K \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!]$, which is an approximation to the deformation of the uniformizer π_K and p-basis as in [21, Theorem 3.2.7]. Then, we introduce the thickening spaces for the extension L/K (See [21, Section 3.1] for motivations).

As a reminder, we assume Hypothesis 2.1.2 for this section; we fix a finite p-basis (b_J) and a uniformizer π_K of K.

Construction 2.2.1. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$. An *$r$-th p-basis decomposition* of h is to write h as

$$h = \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} b_J^{e_J} \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{(r),e_J,n}} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} \big) \pi_K^n \Big) \tag{2.2.1.1}$$

for some $\alpha_{(r),e_J,n,n'} \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times \cup \{0\}$ and some $\lambda_{(r),e_J,n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Such expressions always exist but are not unique. For $r' > r$, we can express each of $\alpha_{(r),e_J,n,n'}$ in (2.2.1.1) using an $(r'-r)$-th p-basis decomposition and then rearrange the formal sum to obtain an r'-th p-basis decomposition. For $h \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, we say that an r'-th p-basis decomposition is *compatible* with the r-th p-basis decomposition in (2.2.1.1) if it can be obtained in the above sense.

For each $h \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times \backslash \{1\}$, we fix a compatible system of r-th p-basis decomposition of h for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the function $\psi : \mathcal{O}_K \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_{J^+}]\!]$ as follows: for $h \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, define

$$\psi(h) = \lim_{r \to +\infty} \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} (b_J + \delta_J)^{e_J} \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{(r),e_J,n}} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} \big) (\pi_K + \delta_0)^n \Big). \tag{2.2.1.2}$$

This expression converges by the compatibility of the p-basis decompositions. Define $\psi(1) = 1$, which corresponds to the naïve compatible system of p-basis decomposition of the element 1. For $h \in \mathcal{O}_K \backslash \{0\}$, write $h = \pi_K^s h_0$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_0 \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$. Define $\psi(h) = (\pi_K + \delta_0)^s \psi'(h_0)$, where $\psi'(h_0)$ is the limit as in (2.2.1.2) with respect to a compatible system of p-basis decompositions of h_0 (which does not have to be the same as the one that defines $\psi(h_0)$). Finally, we define $\psi(0) = 0$.

Most of the time, it is more convenient to view ψ as a function on $\mathcal{O}_K$ which takes value in the larger ring $\mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!]$.

We naturally extend ψ to polynomial rings or formal power series rings with coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_K$ by applying ψ termwise.

Notation 2.2.2. For the rest of the paper, let $\mathcal{R}_K = \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!]$.

Caution 2.2.3. The map ψ is *not* a homomorphism; this is because one cannot "deform" the uniformizer in the mixed characteristic case. Moreover, since K will not be absolutely unramified in applications, p-basis may not deform freely either. However, Proposition 2.2.5 below says that ψ is approximately a homomorphism.

Definition 2.2.4. For two $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebras R_1 and R_2 and an ideal I of R_2, an *approximate homomorphism modulo I* is a function $f : R_1 \to R_2$ such that for $h_1 \in \pi_K^{a_1} R_1$ and $h_2 \in \pi_K^{a_2} R_2$ with $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\psi(h_1 h_2) - \psi(h_1)\psi(h_2) \in \pi_K^{a_1+a_2} I$ and $\psi(h_1 + h_2) - \psi(h_1) - \psi(h_2) \in \pi_K^{\min\{a_1,a_2\}} I$.

Moreover, if R_1' and R_2' are two $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebras, a diagram of functions

$$\begin{tikzcd} R_1' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "g"] & R_2' \arrow[d, "g'"] \\ R_1 \arrow[r, "f"] & R_2 \end{tikzcd}$$

is called *approximately commutative modulo I* if for $h \in \pi_K^a R_1'$, $g'(f'(h)) - f(g(h)) \in \pi_K^a I$.

Proposition 2.2.5. *For $h \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we have $\psi(h) - h \in (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_{J^+}]\!]$. Modulo $I_K = p(\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)\mathcal{R}_K$, $\psi(h)$ does not depend on the choice of the compatible system of p-basis decompositions. Hence, ψ is an approximate homomorphism modulo I_K.*

Proof. First, $\psi(h) - h \in (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_{J^+}]\!]$ is obvious from the construction. Next, we observe that when $p^r > \beta_K$, in any r-th p-basis decomposition for $h \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, the sum $\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{(r),e_J,n}} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} \pi_K^n$ for any e_J and n in (2.2.1.1) is well-defined modulo p. So, the ambiguity of defining ψ lies in I_K.

For $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, the formal sum or product of compatible systems of p-basis decompositions of h_1 and h_2 are just some compatible systems of p-basis decompositions of $h_1 + h_2$ or $h_1 h_2$. Thus, $\psi(h_1) + \psi(h_2)$ and $\psi(h_1)\psi(h_2)$ are the same as $\psi(h_1 + h_2)$ and $\psi(h_1 h_2)$ modulo I_K. The statement for general elements in $\mathcal{O}_K$ follows from this. □

Remark 2.2.6. From Proposition 2.2.5, we see that the ideal case is when $\beta_K \gg 1$. In contrast, when $\beta_K = 1$, $I_K = (\delta_0, p\delta_J)$. The above proposition does not give us much information about ψ. This is why we are not able to prove Conjecture 1.2.11 in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case. This reflects the restraints in [3] from a different point of view, where Abbes and Saito formulated the dichotomy as follows.

$$\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{Z}_p} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} k = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{j\in J} k \cdot db_j & \text{if } \beta_K = 1, \\ \bigoplus_{j \in J} k \cdot db_j \oplus k \cdot d\pi_K & \text{if } \beta_K > 1. \end{cases}$$

Hypothesis 2.2.7. For the rest of the section, assume that K is not absolutely unramified, i.e., $\beta_K \geq 2$.

Lemma 2.2.8. *Let $h \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Denote $dh = \bar{h}_0 d\pi_K + \bar{h}_1 db_1 + \cdots + \bar{h}_n db_m$ when viewed as a differential in $\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{Z}_p} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} k$. Then $\psi(h) - h \equiv \bar{h}_0\delta_0 + \cdots + \bar{h}_m \delta_m$ modulo $(\pi_K) + (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)^2$ in $\mathcal{R}_K$.*

Proof. For an r-th p-basis decomposition ($r \geq 1$) as in (2.2.1.1), we have, modulo the ideal $(\pi_K) + (\delta_{J^+})(\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(h) - h &\equiv \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{(r),e_J,n}} \Big((b_J + \delta_J)^{e_J} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} (\pi_K + \delta_0)^n - b_J^{e_J} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} \pi_K^n \Big) \\ &\equiv \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{(r),e_J,n}} \alpha^{p^r}_{(r),e_J,n,n'} b_J^{e_J} \pi_K^n \big(\frac{n\delta_0}{\pi_K} + \frac{e_1\delta_1}{b_1} + \cdots + \frac{e_m\delta_m}{b_m} \big) \equiv \bar{h}_0\delta_0 + \cdots + \bar{h}_m\delta_m. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit does not break the congruence relation. □

Definition 2.2.9. Denote $\mathcal{S}_K = \mathcal{R}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle$. For $\omega \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{N} \cap [1, \beta_K]$, we say a set of elements $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ *has error gauge* $\geq \omega$ if $R_0 \in (N^\omega \delta_0, N^{\omega+1}\delta_J) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ and $R_j \in (N^{\omega-1}\delta_0, N^\omega \delta_J) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ for all $j \in J$. We say (R_{J^+}) is *admissible* if it has error gauge ≥ 1.

Definition 2.2.10. Let $a > 1$. We define the *standard (non-logarithmic) thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,\psi}$ of L/K to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\psi} = K\langle \pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle\langle u_{J^+}\rangle / \big(\psi(p_{J^+})\big).$$

For $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ admissible, we define the *(non-logarithmic) thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,R_{J^+}}$ to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}} = K\langle \pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle\langle u_{J^+}\rangle / \big(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+}\big).$$

Similarly, for $a > 0$, we define the *standard logarithmic thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,\log,\psi}$ of L/K to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,\psi} = K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_J\rangle\langle u_{J^+}\rangle / \big(\psi(p_{J^+})\big).$$

For $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathcal{S}_K$ admissible, we define the *logarithmic thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$ to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} = K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_J\rangle\langle u_{J^+}\rangle \big/ \big(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+}\big).$$

Denote $TS_{L/K,R_{J^+}} = \cup_{a>0} TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$. Then we have a natural Cartesian diagram for $a > 0$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
TS^{a+1}_{L/K,R_{J^+}} \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, "\Pi"] & TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, "\Pi"] & TS_{L/K,R_{J^+}} \arrow[d, "\Pi"] \\
A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^{a+1}] \arrow[r, hook] & A^1_K[0,\theta^{a+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^a] \arrow[r, hook] & A^1_K[0,\theta) \times A^m_K[0,1)
\end{tikzcd}$$

Remark 2.2.11. Error gauge is supposed to measure how "standard" a thickening space is. Unfortunately, a standard thickening space itself depends on a very non-canonical function ψ. However, by Proposition 2.2.5, the notion of having error gauge $\geq \omega$ does not depend on the choice of ψ if $\omega \in [1, \beta_K]$; note that the terms in p_0 are all divisible by π_K, except u_0^e.

Remark 2.2.12. The upshot of introducing non-standard thickening spaces (or rather thickening spaces which do not have error gauge $\geq \beta_K$) is, as we will show later, that adding a generic p-th root of an element of the p-basis results in the error gauge of (R_{J^+}) dropping by one; the comparison Theorem 2.3.3 guarantees that as long as (R_{J^+}) is admissible, the thickening spaces still compute the same ramification break. On the same issue, if $\beta_K = 1$, we can not afford to drop the error gauge; this is why we are not able to prove Conjecture 1.2.11 in the absolutely unramified and non-logarithmic case (see also Remark 2.2.6).

Notation 2.2.13. Let $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ be admissible. We extend Δ to mean the composite

$$\mathcal{S}_K\big/\big(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+}\big) \xrightarrow{\bmod (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)} \mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+}) \xrightarrow[\simeq]{\Delta} \mathcal{O}_L.$$

We remark that $\psi(p_{J^+}) - p_{J^+} + R_{J^+}$ are in fact contained in the ideal of $\mathcal{S}_K$ generated by δ_{J^+}. We denote the composition of Δ and the reduction $\mathcal{O}_L \twoheadrightarrow l$ by $\overline{\Delta}$.

Lemma 2.2.14. *Let $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ be admissible. Then*

$$\big\{u_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} | e_j \in \{0, \dots, p^{r_j} - 1\} \text{ for all } j \in J, \text{ and } e_0 \in \{0, \dots, e-1\}\big\} \qquad (2.2.14.1)$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{S}_K/(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+})$ over $\mathcal{R}_K$. As a consequence, they form a basis of $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$ over $K\langle \pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle$ for $a > 1$ and a basis of $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$ over $K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_J\rangle$ for $a > 0$. In particular, the morphism $\Pi : TS_{L/K,R_{J^+}} \to A^1_K[0,\theta) \times A^m_K[0,1)$ is finite and flat.

Proof. Given an element $h \in \mathcal{S}_K/(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+})$, we first take a representative $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{S}_K$ in $\mathcal{S}_K$. Then we can simplify it by iteratively replacing u_0^e and $u_j^{p^{r_j}}$ by $u_0^e - \psi(p_0) - R_0$ and $u_j^{p^{r_j}} - \psi(p_j) - R_j$ for $j \in J$, respectively. This procedure converges and gives an element with the power of u_0 smaller than e and power of u_j smaller than p^{r_j} for $j \in J$. ☐

2.3 $AS = TS$ theorem

In [21], the essential step which links the arithmetic conductors and the differential conductors is the comparison theorem ([21, Theorem 4.3.6]), which asserts that the lifted Abbes-Saito spaces are isomorphic to the thickening spaces. In the mixed characteristic case, we do not have to lift the Abbes-Saito spaces. Instead, in this subsection, we prove a (slightly general) comparison theorem over the base field K.

Remember that Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7 are still assumed here. We start with a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 2.3.1. *Keep the notation as in Construction 2.1.6. Then for any* $j \in J$, $d(\bar{c}_j^{p^{r_j}})$ *is nontrivial in* $\Omega^1_{\mathbf{k}_{j-1}/\mathbb{F}_p}$ *modulo the vector space generated by* $d\bar{c}_1, \dots, d\bar{c}_{j-1}$.

Proof. Since $[\mathbf{k}_j : \mathbf{k}_{j-1}] = p^{r_j}$, $d(\bar{c}_j^{p^{r_j}}) \neq 0$ in $\Omega^1_{\mathbf{k}_{j-1}/\mathbb{F}_p}$. Moreover, since $\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_m$ form a basis of $\Omega^1_{l/\mathbb{F}_p}$, there should not be any auxiliary relation between $d\bar{c}_1, \dots, d\bar{c}_{j-1}$ (given by $d(\bar{c}_j^{p^{r_j}})$) in $\Omega^1_{\mathbf{k}_j/\mathbb{F}_p}$. This proves the lemma. ☐

Lemma 2.3.2. *Let* $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ *be admissible. We have*

$$\det\Big(\frac{\partial(\psi(p_i) - p_i + R_i)}{\partial \delta_j}\Big)_{i,j \in J^+}\Big|_{\delta_{J^+}=0} \in \big(\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+})\big)^\times = \mathcal{O}_L^\times.$$

Proof. It is enough to prove that the matrix is of full rank modulo π_L. By Lemma 2.2.8 and the admissibility of R_{J^+}, modulo π_L, the first row will be all zero except the first element which is 1. Hence, we need only to look at

$$\Big(\frac{\partial(\psi(p_i) - p_i)}{\partial \delta_j}\Big)_{i,j \in J} \bmod (\pi_L, \delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J) = \Big(\frac{\partial(\psi(\tilde{b}_i) - \tilde{b}_i)}{\partial \delta_j}\Big)_{i,j \in J} \bmod (\pi_L, \delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J) \quad (2.3.2.1)$$

Let $\bar{\alpha}_{ij} \in l$ denote the entries in the matrix on the right hand side of (2.3.2.1), where we identify $\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+}, u_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} l$. Under this identification, $\tilde{b}_i$ will become $\bar{c}_i^{p^{r_i}}$ for all $i \in J$. It suffices to show that the i-th row is l-linearly independent from the first $i-1$ rows for all i. If we write

$$\bar{c}_i^{p^{r_i}} = \sum_{e_1=0}^{p^{r_0}-1} \cdots \sum_{e_{i-1}=0}^{p^{r_{i-1}}-1} \bar{\lambda}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1}} \bar{c}_1^{e_1} \cdots \bar{c}_{i-1}^{e_{i-1}},$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1}} \in k$ for which $d\bar{\lambda}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1}} = \bar{\mu}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1},1} d\bar{b}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\mu}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1},m} d\bar{b}_m$, then by Lemma 2.2.8,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\alpha}_{i1} d\bar{b}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\alpha}_{im} d\bar{b}_m &= \sum_{e_1=0}^{p^{r_0}-1} \cdots \sum_{e_{i-1}=0}^{p^{r_{i-1}}-1} u_1^{e_1} \cdots u_{i-1}^{e_{i-1}} \big(\bar{\mu}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1},1} d\bar{b}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\mu}_{e_1,\dots,e_{i-1},m} d\bar{b}_m\big) \\ &\equiv d(\bar{c}_i^{p^{r_i}}) \text{ modulo } \big(d\bar{c}_1, \dots, d\bar{c}_{i-1}\big)\end{aligned}$$

in $\Omega^1_{\mathbf{k}_{i-1}/\mathbb{F}_p}$, which is nontrivial by Lemma 2.3.1. But we know that the sums $\bar{\alpha}_{i'1} d\bar{b}_1 + \cdots + \bar{\alpha}_{i'm} db_m$ for $i' < i$ all lie in the submodule of $\Omega^1_{\mathbf{k}_{i-1}/\mathbb{F}_p}$ generated by $d\bar{c}_1, \dots, d\bar{c}_{i-1}$. Hence the i-th row of the matrix in (2.3.2.1) is ($\mathbf{k}_{i-1}$-)linearly independent from the first $i-1$ rows. The lemma follows. ☐

Theorem 2.3.3. *If* $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ *is admissible, we have isomorphisms of* K*-algebras*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K} &\simeq \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}} \quad \text{if} \quad a > 1, \\ \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log} &\simeq \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \quad \text{if} \quad a > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to [21, Theorem 4.3.6]. We will match up u_{J^+} in both rings.

First, $\{u_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} | e_j \in \{0, \dots, p^{r_j}-1\}$ for all $j \in J$, and $e_0 \in \{0, \dots, e-1\}\}$ forms a basis of $\mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log}$) over $K\langle \pi_K^{-a} V_{J^+}\rangle$ (resp. $K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1} V_0, \pi_K^{-a} V_J\rangle$) as a finite free module. Given

$$h = \sum_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} V_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} u_{J^+}^{e'_{J^+}} \in \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K} \text{ (resp. } \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log})$$

written in this basis, where $\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \in K$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} |h|_{AS,a} &= \max\nolimits_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \left\{ |\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{ae_0 + \cdots + ae_m + e'_0/e} \right\} \\ \text{(resp. } |h|_{AS,\log,a} &= \max\nolimits_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \left\{ |\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{(a+1)e_0 + ae_1 + \cdots + ae_m + e'_0/e} \right\}). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log}$) is complete for this norm. The requirement $a > 1$ in the non-logarithmic case guarantees that when substituting u_0^e by $u_0^e - p_0 - V_0$, the norm does not increase.

Similarly, by Lemma 2.2.14, $\{u_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} | e_j \in \{0, \dots, p^{r_j} - 1\}$ for all $j \in J$, and $e_0 \in \{0, \dots, e-1\}\}$ also forms a basis of $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$) over $K\langle \pi_K^{-a} \delta_{J^+}\rangle$ (resp. $K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1} \delta_0, \pi_K^{-a} \delta_J\rangle$) as a finite free module. Given

$$h = \sum_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \delta_{J^+}^{e_{J^+}} u_{J^+}^{e'_{J^+}} \in \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}} \text{ (resp. } \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}})$$

written in this basis, where $\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \in K$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} |h|_{TS,a} &= \max\nolimits_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \left\{ |\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{ae_0 + \cdots + ae_m + e'_0/e} \right\} \\ \text{(resp. } |h|_{TS,\log,a} &= \max\nolimits_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}} \left\{ |\alpha_{e_{J^+}, e'_{J^+}}| \cdot \theta^{(a+1)e_0 + ae_1 + \cdots + ae_m + e'_0/e} \right\}). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$) is complete for this norm. The requirement $a > 1$ in the non-logarithmic case guarantees that when substituting u_0^e by $u_0^e - \psi(p_0) - R_0$, the norm does not increase.

Define $\chi_1 : \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K} \to \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$ (resp. $\chi_1 : \mathcal{O}^a_{AS,L/K,\log} \to \mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$) by sending u_{J^+} to u_{J^+} and hence V_j to $p_j(u_{J^+}) = p_j(u_{J^+}) - \psi(p_j(u_{J^+})) - R_j$ for all $j \in J^+$. We need to verify the convergence condition for all V_j. Indeed, Proposition 2.2.5 and the admissibility of R_{J^+} imply that

$$|p_j - \psi(p_j)|_{TS,a} \leq \theta^a, \quad |R_j|_{TS,a} \leq \theta^a \text{ for all } j \in J^+$$

$$\text{(resp. } |p_j - \psi(p_j)|_{TS,\log,a} \leq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \theta^{a+1} & j = 0 \\ \theta^a & j \in J \end{array} \right., \ |R_j|_{TS,\log,a} \leq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \theta^{a+1+1/e} & j = 0 \\ \theta^{a+1/e} & j \in J \end{array} \right.).$$

Now we define the inverse χ_2 of χ_1. Obviously, one should send u_{J^+} back to u_{J^+}. We need to define $\chi_2(\delta_{J^+})$. By Lemma 2.3.2,

$$A = (A_{ij})_{i,j\in J^+} := \Big(\frac{\partial(\psi(p_i)+R_i)}{\partial\delta_j}\Big)_{i,j\in J^+}\Big|_{\delta_{J^+}=0} \in \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}(\mathcal{O}_L) \cong \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}\big(\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+})\big).$$

Let A^{-1} denote the inverse matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}\big(\mathcal{O}_K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+})\big)$, whose entries are written as polynomials in u_{J^+} (using the basis (2.2.14.1)). Thus,

$$A^{-1}\cdot A - I \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m+1}\big((\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}\big) \text{ (resp. } \mathrm{Mat}_{m+1}\big((\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}\big)\text{)}, \quad (2.3.3.1)$$

where I is the $(m+1)\times(m+1)$ identity matrix. Now, we write

$$\begin{pmatrix}\delta_0\\ \vdots\\ \delta_m\end{pmatrix} = (I-A^{-1}A)\begin{pmatrix}\delta_0\\ \vdots\\ \delta_m\end{pmatrix} - A^{-1}\left(\begin{pmatrix}\psi(p_0)-p_0+R_0\\ \vdots\\ \psi(p_m)-p_m+R_m\end{pmatrix} - A\begin{pmatrix}\delta_0\\ \vdots\\ \delta_m\end{pmatrix}\right) - A^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}p_0\\ \vdots\\ p_m\end{pmatrix}; \quad (2.3.3.2)$$

the last term is just $-A^{-1}\cdot\chi_1(V_{J^+})$. We need to bound the first two terms.

By (2.3.3.1), $I-A^{-1}A$ has norm $\leq\theta^a$. Hence, in the non-logarithmic case, the first term in (2.3.3.2) has norm $\leq\theta^{2a}$; in the logarithmic case the first term in (2.3.3.2) has norm $\leq\theta^{2a}$, except for the first row, which has norm $\leq\theta^{2a+1}$. By the definition of A, the second term in (2.3.3.2) has entries in $(\delta_{J^+})(\delta_0/\pi_K,\delta_J)\cdot\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$, except for the first row, which is in $(\delta_0/\pi_K,\delta_J)^2\cdot\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$. Hence, in the non-logarithmic case, the term has norm $\leq\theta^{2a-1}$; in the logarithmic case, the term has norm $\leq\theta^{2a}$, except for the first row, which has norm $\leq\theta^{2a+1}$.

Since we want χ_2 to be the inverse of χ_1, we define recursively by

$$\chi_2\begin{pmatrix}\delta_0\\ \vdots\\ \delta_m\end{pmatrix} = -A^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}V_0\\ \vdots\\ V_m\end{pmatrix} + \chi_2\begin{pmatrix}\Lambda_0\\ \vdots\\ \Lambda_m\end{pmatrix},$$

where Λ_{J^+} denotes the sum of the first two terms in (2.3.3.2). Since Λ_{J^+} have strictly smaller norms than δ_{J^+} and Λ_{J^+} are in the ideal (δ_{J^+}), one can plug the image of $\chi_2(\delta_{J^+})$ back into $\chi_2(\Lambda_{J^+})$ and iterate this substitution. This construction will converge to a continuous homomorphism χ_2, which is an inverse of χ_1. Moreover, from the construction, one can see that

$$|\chi_2(\delta_j)|_{AS,a}\leq\theta^a, \text{ for all } j\in J^+,$$
$$|\chi_2(\delta_0)|_{AS,\log,a}\leq\theta^{a+1} \text{ and } |\chi_2(\delta_j)|_{AS,\log,a}\leq\theta^a \text{ for all } j\in J.$$

Therefore, we have two continuous homomorphisms χ_1 and χ_2, being inverse to each other; this concludes the proof. □

Remark 2.3.4. An alternative way to understand this theorem is to think of the thickening spaces as perturbations of the morphisms $AS^a_{L/K}\to A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^a]$ and $AS^a_{L/K,\log}\to A^1_K[0,\theta^{a+1}]\times A^m_K[0,\theta^a]$. Abbes-Saito spaces will behave better under base change using the new morphisms.

2.4 Étaleness of the thickening spaces

In this subsection, we will study a variant of [2, Theorem 7.2] and [3, Corollary 4.12].

Remember that Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7 are still in force.

Definition 2.4.1. Let $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ be an admissible subset. Let $ET_{L/K,R_{J+}}$ be the rigid analytic subspace of $A^1_K[0,\eta) \times A^m_K[0,1)$ over which the morphism Π defined in Definition 2.2.10 is étale. When there is no ambiguity of R_{J^+}, we may omit it from the notation by writing $ET_{L/K}$ instead.

Theorem 2.4.2. *Let $b(L/K)$ be the highest non-logarithmic ramification break of L/K. There exists $\epsilon \in (0, b(L/K)-1)$ such that for any $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ admissible, $A^{m+1}_K[0, \theta^{b(L/K)-\epsilon}] \subseteq ET_{L/K,R_{J+}}$.*

Proof. Recall from [2, Proposition 7.3] that

$$\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K} = \oplus_{i=1}^r \mathcal{O}_L/\pi_L^{\alpha_i}\mathcal{O}_L \text{ with } \alpha_i < e(b(L/K)-\epsilon) \tag{2.4.2.1}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. It does not hurt to take $\epsilon < b(L/K)-1$. Let $\mathcal{J} = \big(\partial(\psi(p_i)+R_i)/\partial u_j\big)_{i,j\in J^+}$ be the Jacobian matrix of $TS^a_{L/K,R_{J+}}$ over $A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^a]$, whose entries are elements in $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_K\langle \pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/\big(\psi(p_i)+R_i\big)$.

Let $a \geq b(L/K)-\epsilon$ and $P = (\delta_{J^+}) \in A^1_K[0,\theta^a]$ be any point. Suppose the thickening space is not étale at P. Then the relative differential $\Omega^1_{TS^a_{L/K,R_{J+}}/A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^a]}$ have a constituent isomorphic to $K(P)$ at P, where $K(P)$ is the residue field at P. This implies that $\operatorname{Coker}(\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{O})$ has a torsion-free constituent at P.

One the other hand, at P, $|\delta_j| \leq \theta^a$ for $j \in J^+$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} \bmod \pi_K^a &\equiv \big(\partial p_i/\partial u_j\big)_{i,j\in J^+} \bmod \pi_K^a, \\ \operatorname{Coker}(\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathcal{O}/\pi_K^a &= \operatorname{Coker}(\mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{(\partial p_i/\partial u_j)} \mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathcal{O}/\pi_K^a, \end{aligned}$$

which should not have a direct summand $\mathcal{O}_L/\pi_K^a\mathcal{O}_L$ according to (2.4.2.1) because $a > \alpha_i$ for all i. Contradiction. We have the étaleness as stated. □

Remark 2.4.3. Theorem 2.4.2 (as well as Theorem 2.4.5 later) states that the étale locus $ET_{L/K,R_{J+}}$ is a bit larger than the locus where $TS^a_{L/K,R_{J+}}$ (resp. $TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J+}}$) becomes a geometrically disjoint union of $[L:K]$ discs.

The following lemma is an easy fact about logarithmic relative differentials. This is not a good place to introduce the whole theory of logarithmic structure. For a systematic account of logarithmic structures and log-schemes, one may consult [13, Section 4] and [12].

Lemma 2.4.4. *If we provide $\mathcal{O}_L$ and $\mathcal{O}_K$ with the canonical log-structures $\pi_L^{\mathbb{N}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L$ and $\pi_K^{\mathbb{N}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$, respectively, then the logarithmic relative differentials*

$$\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K}(\log/\log) = \bigoplus_{j\in J} \mathcal{O}_L du_j \oplus \mathcal{O}_L \frac{du_0}{u_0} \Big/ \Big(d(p_J), \frac{d(p_0)}{\pi_K}, \frac{d\pi_K}{\pi_K}, dx \textit{ for } x \in \mathcal{O}_K\Big).$$

Theorem 2.4.5. *Let* $b_{\log}(L/K)$ *be the highest logarithmic ramification break of* L/K. *Then there exists* $\epsilon \in (0, b_{\log}(L/K))$ *such that, for any* $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ *admissible,* $A_K^1[0, \theta^{b_{\log}(L/K)+1-\epsilon}] \times A_K^m[0, \theta^{b_{\log}(L/K)-\epsilon}] \subseteq ET_{L/K,R_{J^+}}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to Theorem 2.4.2 except that we need to invoke [3, Proposition 4.11(2)] to give a bound on $\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K}(\log/\log)$; the explicit description of $\Omega^1_{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathcal{O}_K}(\log/\log)$ in Lemma 2.4.4 singles out δ_0 and gives rise to the smaller radius θ^{a+1}. □

2.5 Construction of differential modules

In this subsection, we set up the framework of interpreting ramification filtrations by differential modules.

As a reminder, we keep Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7.

Construction 2.5.1. Let $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ be admissible. By Lemma 2.2.14, $\Pi : \Pi^{-1}(ET_{L/K}) \to ET_{L/K}$ is finite and étale. We call $\mathcal{E} = \Pi_*(\mathcal{O}_{\Pi^{-1}(ET_{L/K})})$ *a differential module associated to* L/K; it is defined over $ET_{L/K}$ and given by

$$\nabla : \mathcal{E} \to \Pi_*\big(\Omega^1_{\Pi^{-1}(ET_{L/K})/K}\big) \simeq \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{ET_{L/K}}} \Omega^1_{ET_{L/K}/K} = \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{ET_{L/K}}} \Big(\bigoplus_{j \in J^+} \mathcal{O}_{ET_{L/K}} d\delta_j\Big).$$

Thus, we can define the action of differential operators $\partial_j = \partial/\partial\delta_j$ for $j \in J^+$ on $\mathcal{E}$ and talk about intrinsic radius $IR(\mathcal{E}; s_{J^+})$ as in Notation 1.1.13 if $A_K^1[0, \theta^{s_0}] \times \cdots \times A_K^1[0, \theta^{s_m}] \subseteq ET_{L/K}$.

Proposition 2.5.2. *The following statements are equivalent for* $a > 1$ *(resp.* $a > 0$*):*

(1) The highest non-logarithmic (resp., logarithmic) ramification break satisfies $b(L/K) \leq a$ *(resp.* $b_{\log}(L/K) \leq a$*);*

(2) For any (some) admissible $(R_{J^+}) \subset \mathcal{S}_K$ *and any rational number* $a' > a$,

$$\#\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(TS^{a'}_{L/K,R_{J^+}}) = [L : K] \ \textit{(resp. } \#\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(TS^{a'}_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}) = [L : K] \textit{).}$$

(3) For any (some) admissible $(R_{J^+}) \subset \mathcal{S}_K$, $A_K^{m+1}[0, \theta^a] \subseteq ET_{L/K,R_{J^+}}$ *(resp.* $A_K^1[0, \theta^{a+1}] \times A_K^m[0, \theta^a] \subseteq ET_{L/K,R_{J^+}}$*) and the intrinsic radius of* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $A_K^{m+1}[0, \theta^a]$ *(resp.* $A_K^1[0, \theta^{a+1}] \times A_K^m[0, \theta^a]$*) is maximal:*

$$IR(\mathcal{E}; \underline{a}) = 1 \ \textit{(resp. } IR(\mathcal{E}; a+1, \underline{a}) = 1\textit{)}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to [21, Theorem 3.4.5].

(1) ⇔ (2) is immediate from Theorem 2.3.3.

(2) ⇒ (3): For any rational number $a' > a$, (2) implies that for some finite extension K' of K, $TS^{a'}_{L/K,R_{J^+}} \times_K K'$ (resp. $TS^{a'}_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \times_K K'$) has $[L : K]$ connected components and is hence force to be $[L : K]$ copies of $A^{m+1}_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'}]$ (resp. $A^1_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'+1}] \times A^m_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'}]$) because Π is finite and flat; in particular, Π is étale there. Therefore, $\mathcal{E} \otimes_K K'$ is a trivial differential module over $A^{m+1}_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'}]$ (resp. $A^1_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'+1}] \times A^m_{K'}[0, \theta^{a'}]$). As a consequence,

$$IR(\mathcal{E}; \underline{a'}) = IR(\mathcal{E} \otimes K'; \underline{a'}) = 1 \text{ (resp. } IR(\mathcal{E}; a'+1, \underline{a'}) = IR(\mathcal{E} \otimes_K K'; a'+1, \underline{a'}) = 1 \text{).}$$

Statement (3) follows from the continuity of intrinsic radii in Proposition 1.1.23(a).

(3) ⇒ (2): (3) implies that, for any rational number $a' > a$, $\mathcal{E}$ is a trivial differential module on $A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^{a'}]$ (resp. $A^1_K[0,\theta^{a'+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^{a'}]$). Indeed, we have a bijection

$$H^0_\nabla(A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^{a'}],\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{E}|_{\delta_{J^+}=0} \text{ (resp. } H^0_\nabla(A^1_K[0,\theta^{a'+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^{a'}],\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{E}|_{\delta_{J^+}=0} \text{)}, \tag{2.5.2.1}$$

whose inverse is given by Taylor series. This is in fact a ring isomorphism by basic properties of Taylor series. The left hand side of (2.5.2.1) is a subring of $\mathcal{O}^{a'}_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^{a'}_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$); the right hand side is just $K\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+}) \simeq L$. Thus, after the extension of scalars from K to L, we can lift the idempotent elements in $L \otimes_K L \simeq \prod_{g\in G_{L/K}} L_g$ to idempotent elements in $\mathcal{O}^{a'}_{TS,L/K,R_{J^+}} \otimes_K L$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}^{a'}_{TS,L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \otimes_K L$). This proves (2). □

Corollary 2.5.3. *Given the differential module $\mathcal{E}$ over $ET_{L/K}$ with respect to some admissible subset $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} b(L/K) &= \min\big\{s \,\big|\, A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^s] \subseteq ET_{L/K} \text{ and } IR(\mathcal{E};\underline{s}) = 1\big\}, \text{ and} \\ b_{\log}(L/K) &= \min\big\{s \,\big|\, A^1_K[0,\theta^{s+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^s] \subseteq ET_{L/K} \text{ and } IR(\mathcal{E};s+1,\underline{s}) = 1\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $b(L/K)$ (resp. $b_{\log}(L/K)$) corresponds to the intersection of the boundary of $Z(\mathcal{E})$ with the line defined by $s_0 = \cdots = s_m$ (resp. $s_0 - 1 = s_1 = \cdots = s_m$).

Proof. It is obvious from Propositions 2.5.2 and 1.1.23. □

2.6 Recursive thickening spaces

In this subsection, we introduce a generalization of thickening spaces. This will give us some freedom when changing the base field.

In this subsection, we continue to assume Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7.

Construction 2.6.1. This is a variant of Construction 2.1.6. First, filter the (inseparable) extension l/k by elementary p-extensions

$$k = k_0 \subsetneq k_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq k_r = l,$$

where for each $\lambda = 1,\dots,r$, $k_\lambda = k_{\lambda-1}(\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_\lambda)$ with $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_\lambda^p = \bar{\mathfrak{b}}_\lambda \in k_{\lambda-1}$. Denote $\Lambda = \{1,\dots,r\}$. Pick lifts $\mathfrak{c}_\Lambda$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_\Lambda$ in $\mathcal{O}_L$. Let $e = e_0,\dots,e_{r_0} = 1$ be a strictly decreasing sequence of integers such that $e_i \mid e_{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r_0$. Set $I = \{1,\dots,r_0\}$. For each $i \in I$, pick an element $\pi_{L,i}$ in $\mathcal{O}_L$ with valuation e_i; in particular, we take $\pi_{L,r_0} = \pi_L$. It is easy to see that $(\mathfrak{c}_\Lambda, \pi_{L,I})$ generate $\mathcal{O}_L$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$. So we have an isomorphism

$$\Delta : \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle/\mathfrak{J} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_L,$$

sending $\mathfrak{u}_{0,i} \mapsto \pi_{L,i}$ for $i \in I$ and $\mathfrak{u}_\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{c}_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where $\mathfrak{J}$ is some proper ideal and we use the same Δ as in Construction 2.1.6. Moreover,

$$\Big\{\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}^{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I}} \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda^{\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda} \Big| \mathfrak{e}_{0,i} \in \{0,\dots,\frac{e_{i-1}}{e_i} - 1\} \text{ for all } i \in I \text{ and } \mathfrak{e}_\lambda \in \{0,\dots,p-1\} \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Lambda\Big\} \tag{2.6.1.1}$$

form a basis of $\mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle/\mathfrak{J}$ as a free $\mathcal{O}_K$-module, which we refer later as the *standard basis*.

We provide $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda]$ with the following norm: for $h=\sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I},\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}\alpha_{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I},\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}^{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I}}\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda^{\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}$ with $\alpha_{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I},\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}\in\mathcal{O}_K$, we set

$$|h|=\max_{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I},\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}\{|\alpha_{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I},\mathfrak{e}_\Lambda}|\cdot\theta^{(\mathfrak{e}_{0,1}\cdot e_1+\cdots+\mathfrak{e}_{0,r_0}\cdot e_{r_0})/e}\}.$$

For $a\in\frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we use $\mathfrak{N}^a$ to denote the set consisting of elements in $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda]$ with norm $\leq\theta^a$; it is in fact an ideal.

In $\mathcal{O}_K\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle/\mathfrak{I}$, we can write $\mathfrak{u}_{0,i}^{e_{i-1}/e_i}$ for $i\in I$ and $\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda^p$ in terms of the basis (2.6.1.1). This gives a set of generators of $\mathfrak{I}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{p}_{0,1} &\in \mathfrak{u}_{0,1}^{e/e_1}-\mathfrak{d}_1\pi_K+\mathfrak{N}^{1+1/e}\cdot\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda],\\
\mathfrak{p}_{0,i} &\in \mathfrak{u}_{0,i}^{e_{i-1}/e_i}-\mathfrak{d}_i\mathfrak{u}_{0,i-1}+\mathfrak{N}^{(e_{i-1}+1)/e}\cdot\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda],\ i\in I\backslash\{1\},\\
\mathfrak{p}_\lambda &\in \mathfrak{u}_\lambda^p-\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_\lambda+\mathfrak{N}^{1/e}\cdot\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{d}_I$ are some elements in $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda]$ whose images under Δ are invertible in $\mathcal{O}_L$, and for each λ, $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_\lambda$ is some element in $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathfrak{u}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda-1}]$ whose image under Δ reduces to $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}_\lambda\in k_{\lambda-1}$ modulo π_L.

We say that $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda$ *corresponds* to the extension $k_\lambda/k_{\lambda-1}$.

Definition 2.6.2. As in Definition 2.2.9, we define $\mathfrak{S}_K=\mathcal{R}_K\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle=\mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K,\delta_J]\!]\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle$. For $\omega\in\frac{1}{e}\mathbb{N}\cap[1,\beta_K]$, we say that a set of elements $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda)\subset(\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ *has error gauge* $\geq\omega$ if $\mathfrak{R}_{0,i}\in(\mathfrak{N}^{\omega-1+e_i/e}\delta_0,\mathfrak{N}^{\omega+e_i/e}\delta_J)\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ for $i\in I$ and $\mathfrak{R}_\lambda\in(\mathfrak{N}^{\omega-1}\delta_0,\mathfrak{N}^\omega\delta_J)\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda$. The subset $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda)\subset(\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ is *admissible* if it has error gauge ≥ 1.

Let $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda)\subset(\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ be admissible. For $a>1$, we define the *(non-logarithmic) recursive thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}$ to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}=K\langle\pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle\big/\big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})+\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)+\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big).$$

For $a>0$, we define the *logarithmic recursive thickening space (of level a)* $TS^a_{L/K,\log,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}$ to be the rigid space associated to

$$\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}=K\langle\pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0,\pi_K^{-a}\delta_J\rangle\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle\big/\big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})+\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)+\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big).$$

We still use Δ to denote the natural homomorphism

$$\mathfrak{S}_K\big/\big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})+\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)+\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)\xrightarrow{\text{mod }(\delta_0/\pi_K,\delta_J)}\mathcal{O}_K\langle\mathfrak{u}_{0,I},\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle/(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I},\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)\xrightarrow[\simeq]{\Delta}\mathcal{O}_L;$$

we use $\overline{\Delta}$ to denote the composition with the reduction $\mathcal{O}_L\to l$.

Lemma 2.6.3. *Let* $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda)\subset(\delta_{J^+})\cdot\mathfrak{S}_K$ *be admissible. Then* (2.6.1.1) *forms a basis of* $\mathfrak{S}_K/\big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})+\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)+\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)$ *as a free* $\mathcal{R}_K$*-module, which we refer later as the* standard basis. *As a consequence, they form a basis of* $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}$ *(resp.* $\mathcal{O}^a_{TS,L/K,\log,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}$*) as a free module over* $K\langle\pi_K^{-a}\delta_{J^+}\rangle$ *(resp.* $K\langle\pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0,\pi_K^{-a}\delta_J\rangle$*).*

Proof. Same as Lemma 2.2.14. □

Example 2.6.4. The construction of the thickening spaces in Definition 2.2.10 is a special case of the above construction. If we start with a uniformizer π_L, a p-basis c_J, and relations p_{J^+} in Construction 2.1.6, the following dictionary translates the information to fit in Construction 2.6.1.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \pi_{L,I} & \longleftrightarrow & \pi_L \quad (I = \{1\}), \\ \mathfrak{c}_\Lambda & \longleftrightarrow & c_1, c_1^p, \dots, c_1^{p^{r_1-1}}, c_2, c_2^p, \dots, c_m^{p^{r_m-1}}, \\ \mathfrak{p}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda & \longleftrightarrow & \text{the ones determined by } \mathfrak{c}_\Lambda \text{ and } \pi_{L,I}, \\ \mathfrak{R}_{0,I} & \longleftrightarrow & R_0, \\ \mathfrak{R}_\lambda & \longleftrightarrow & R_j \text{ when } \lambda \text{ corresponds to some } c_j^{p^{r_j-1}}, \text{ and 0 otherwise.} \end{array}$$

Moreover, this construction preserves the error gauge.

Conversely, we have the following.

Proposition 2.6.5. *Let* $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ *be admissible with error gauge* $\geq \omega \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{N} \cap [1, \beta_K]$. *Then, for any choices of* c_J *and* π_L *as in Construction 2.1.6, there exists an* $\mathcal{R}_K$*-isomorphism*

$$\Theta : \mathcal{S}_K \big/ \big(\psi(p_{J^+}) + R_{J^+}\big) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{S}_K \big/ \big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big), \tag{2.6.5.1}$$

for some admissible R_{J^+} *with error gauge* $\geq \omega$*, such that* $\Theta \bmod (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)$ *induces the identity map if we identify both side with* $\mathcal{O}_L$ *via* Δ*. This gives isomorphisms between the recursive thickening spaces and thickening spaces.*

$$TS^a_{L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda} \simeq TS^a_{L/K,R_{J^+}} \ (a > 1) \quad \textit{and} \quad TS^a_{L/K,\log,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda} \simeq TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \ (a > 0)$$

Proof. For each $j \in J$, express c_j as a polynomial $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_j$ in $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_\Lambda$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_K$ via $\Delta^{-1} : \mathcal{O}_L \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle / (\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)$, and set $\Theta(u_j) = \psi(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_j)$. We also set $\Theta(u_0) = \mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}$. It is then obvious that for $a \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\Theta(N^a \cdot \mathcal{S}_K) \subset \mathfrak{N}^a \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$.

We need to determine R_{J^+}. For each fixed $j_0 \in J^+$, since $\Delta(p_{j_0}(u_{J^+})) = 0$, we can write

$$p_{j_0}(\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}, \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathfrak{h}_{0,i}\mathfrak{p}_{0,i} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{h}_\lambda \mathfrak{p}_\lambda, \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle$$

for some $\mathfrak{h}_{0,i}, \mathfrak{h}_\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle$ for $i \in I$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Moreover, when $j_0 = 0$, we can require $\mathfrak{h}_{0,i} \in \mathfrak{N}^{1-e_{i-1}/e} \cdot \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle$, and $\mathfrak{h}_\lambda \in \mathfrak{N}^1 \cdot \mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle$ for $i \in I$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Thus,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} -\Theta(R_{j_0}) & = & \psi(p_{j_0})(\Theta(u_{J^+})) \\ & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i \in I} \psi(\mathfrak{h}_{0,i})\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,i}) + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \psi(\mathfrak{h}_\lambda)\psi(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda) + \mathfrak{E} \\ & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i \in I} \psi(\mathfrak{h}_{0,i})(-\mathfrak{R}_{0,i}) + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \psi(\mathfrak{h}_\lambda)(-\mathfrak{R}_\lambda) + \mathfrak{E} \\ & \in & \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\mathfrak{N}^\omega \delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\omega+1}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K & j_0 = 0 \\ (\mathfrak{N}^{\omega-1}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^\omega \delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K & j_0 \in J \end{array} \right. , \end{array}$$

where $\mathfrak{E} \in (\mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{(\beta_K+1)}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ if $j_0 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{E} \in (\mathfrak{N}^{(\beta_K-1)}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ if $j_0 \in J$; they correspond to the error terms coming from ψ failing to be a homomorphism (See Proposition 2.2.5).

Thus, we can find polynomials $q_0, \dots, q_m \in \mathcal{O}_K[u_{J+}]$ such that

$$q_0 \in \begin{cases} N^{\omega} \cdot \mathcal{S}_K & j_0 = 0 \\ N^{\omega-1} \cdot \mathcal{S}_K & j_0 \in J \end{cases} \qquad q_1, \dots, q_m \in \begin{cases} N^{\omega+1} \cdot \mathcal{S}_K & j_0 = 0 \\ N^{\omega} \cdot \mathcal{S}_K & j_0 \in J \end{cases},$$

$$\Theta(R_j - q_0\delta_0 - \cdots - q_m\delta_m) \quad \in \quad \begin{cases} (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)(\mathfrak{N}^{\omega}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\omega+1}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K & j_0 = 0 \\ (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)(\mathfrak{N}^{\omega-1}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\omega}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K & j_0 \in J \end{cases}.$$

Further, we can similarly clear up the coefficients for $\delta_j\delta_{j'}$ for $j, j' \in J$. Repeating this approximation gives the expressions for R_{J+}. They clearly have error gauge $\geq \omega$.

The surjectivity of Θ follows from the surjectivity modulo $(\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)$, which is the identity via Δ. Moreover, a surjective morphism between two finite free modules of the same rank over a Noetherian base is automatically an isomorphism. The theorem is proved. $\square$

Remark 2.6.6. The isomorphism Θ is not unique. Basically, $\Theta(u_0) \bmod (\mathfrak{N}^{\omega}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\omega+1}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ and $\Theta(u_j) \bmod (\mathfrak{N}^{\omega-1}\delta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\omega}\delta_J) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ for $j \in J$ are fixed; any lifts of them will give a desired isomorphism (with different (R_{J+})).

Lemma 2.6.7. *Let $(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda) \subset (\delta_{J+}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ be admissible. Then an element*

$$h \in \mathfrak{S}_K \big/ \big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)$$

is invertible if and only if $\Delta(h) \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$. In particular, $\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}^e/\pi_K$ is invertible.

Proof. The necessity is obvious. To see the sufficiency, we construct the inverse of h directly. Let $h^{(-1)}$ be a lift of $\Delta(h^{-1}) \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$ in $\mathcal{O}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda \rangle$. We have $\Delta(1 - h^{(-1)}h) = 0$ and hence $1 - h^{(-1)}h = g \in (\delta_{J+}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{h} = \frac{h^{(-1)}}{1-g} = h^{(-1)} \cdot (1 + g + g^2 + \cdots).$$

The series converges to the inverse of h. $\square$

We need the following lemma in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5.

Lemma 2.6.8. *Keep the notation as above and let $\omega \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{N} \cap [1, \beta_K]$. Fix $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$. Let $\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda \in (\delta_{J+}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_K$ be an admissible set with error gauge $\geq \omega$. Let $\mathfrak{c}'_{\lambda_0}$ be another element in k_{λ_0} generating $k_{\lambda_0}/k_{\lambda_0 - 1}$. By Construction 2.6.1, we can construction a recursive thickening space using the generators $\{\pi_{L,I}, \mathfrak{c}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{c}'_{\lambda_0}\}$, with variables $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{u}'_{\lambda_0}$ and relations $\mathfrak{p}'_{0,I}, \mathfrak{p}'_\Lambda$. Let $\mathfrak{S}'_K = \mathcal{R}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{u}'_{\lambda_0}\rangle$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{R}_K$-isomorphism*

$$\Theta : \mathfrak{S}'_K \big/ \big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}'_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}'_{0,I}, \psi(\mathfrak{p}'_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}'_\Lambda\big) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{S}_K \big/ \big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)$$

for some admissible set $\mathfrak{R}'_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}'_\Lambda \in (\delta_{J+})\mathcal{R}_K\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{u}'_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ of error gauge $\geq \omega$, such that $\Theta \bmod (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)$ induces the identity map if we identify both side with $\mathcal{O}_L$ via Δ.

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 2.6.5. We first remark that to prove the lemma, it suffices to construct the homomorphism and find the corresponding $\mathfrak{R}'_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}'_\Lambda$; this is because $\Theta \bmod (\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J)$ is an isomorphism and hence Θ would be a surjective homomorphism between two free $\mathcal{R}_K$-modules of the same rank.

Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}'_{\lambda_0}$ denote a polynomial in $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda$ lifting $\mathfrak{c}'_{\lambda_0}$, using the basis (2.6.1.1). Define the continuous $\mathcal{R}_K$-homomorphism $\Theta : \mathfrak{S}'_K \to \mathfrak{S}_K \big/ \big(\psi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \psi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)$ by sending $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$ to $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$, $\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}$ to $\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}$, and $\mathfrak{u}'_{\lambda_0}$ to $\psi(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}'_{\lambda_0})$. Then, we can determine $\mathfrak{R}'_{0,I}, \mathfrak{R}'_\Lambda$ as in Proposition 2.6.5, by first estimating $\Theta(\mathfrak{R}'_{0,I})$ and $\Theta(\mathfrak{R}'_\Lambda)$ and then approximating them by elements in $\mathfrak{S}'_K$. $\square$

3 Hasse-Arf Theorems

3.1 Generic p-th roots

The notion of generic p-th roots was first (implicitly) introduced by Borger in [6]. Kedlaya [17] realized that in the equal characteristic case, adding generic p-th roots into the field extension will not change the (differential) non-logarithmic ramification filtration; hence, one can prove the non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem by reducing to the perfect residue field case.

In this subsection, we assume Hypothesis 2.2.7 only, i.e., we work with arbitrary complete discretely valued field K of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ which is not absolutely unramified.

Notation 3.1.1. Let x be transcendental over K. Define $K(x)^\wedge$ to be the completion of $K(x)$ with respect to the 1-Gauss norm and define K' to be the completion of the maximal unramified extension of $K(x)^\wedge$. Set $L' = K'L$.

Lemma 3.1.2. *Let $L(x)^\wedge$ be the completion with respect to the* 1*-Gauss norm. Then, L' is the completion of the maximal unramified extension of $L(x)^\wedge$. In particular, the residue field of L' is $l' = k(x)^{\mathrm{sep}} \cdot l$, which is separably closed.*

Proof. First, $L(x)^\wedge = LK(x)^\wedge$ because the latter is complete and is dense in the former. So, it suffices to prove that L' is complete and has separable residue field. Since L'/K' is finite, L' is complete. Moreover, the residue field l' of L' is separably closed because it is a finite extension of a separably closed field $k(x)^{\mathrm{sep}}$. ☐

Definition 3.1.3. Let b_{j_0} be an element in a p-basis of K. We will often need to make a base change $K \hookrightarrow \widetilde{K} = K'((b_{j_0} + x\pi_K)^{1/p})$, a process which we shall refer to as *adding a generic p-th root (of b_{j_0})*. It is clear that the absolute ramification degree $\beta_{\widetilde{K}}$ equals β_K. If we start with a finite field extension L/K, adding a generic p-th root will mean considering the extension $\widetilde{L} = L\widetilde{K}/\widetilde{K}$. We have $G_{\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}} = G_{L/K}$ as $\widetilde{K}$ is linearly independent from L over K. By convention, we take $\pi_{\widetilde{K}} = \pi_K$ as $\widetilde{K}/K$ is unramified. We provide $\widetilde{K}$ with a p-basis $\{b_{J\setminus\{j_0\}}, (b_{j_0} + x\pi_K)^{1/p}, x\}$, which has one more element than the p-basis of K.

Proposition 3.1.4. *Let L/K be a finite separable extension of complete discretely valued fields satisfying Hypothesis 2.1.2. Then after finitely many operations of adding generic p-th roots, the field extension we start with becomes a non-fiercely ramified extension, namely, the residue field extension is separable.*

Proof. This proof is almost identical to [21, Proposition 5.2.3], which is stated for equal characteristic complete discretely valued fields and for adding p^∞-th roots (see [21, Definition 5.2.2]).

First, the tamely ramified part is always preserved under these operations. So, we can assume that L/K is totally wildly ramified and hence the Galois group $G_{L/K}$ is a p-group. We can filter the extension L/K as $K = K_0 \subset \cdots \subset K_n = L$, where K_i/K_{i-1} is a (wildly ramified) $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-Galois extension and K_i/K is Galois for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Each of these subextensions

(a) either has inseparable residue field extension (and hence has naïve ramification degree 1),

(b) or has separable residue field extension (and hence has naïve ramification degree p).

We do induction on the maximal i_0 such that K_i/K_{i-1} has separable residual extension for $i = 1, \ldots, i_0$. Obviously adding a generic p-th root does not decrease i_0 because after adding a generic p-th root, the naïve ramification degree of $\widetilde{K}_{i_0}/\widetilde{K}$ still equals to the degree p^{i_0}. Now, it suffices to show that after finitely many operations of adding generic p-th roots, K_{i_0+1}/K_{i_0} has separable residue field extension (if $i_0 < n$). Suppose the contrary.

Let $g \in G_{K_{i_0+1}/K_{i_0}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ be a generator. We claim that $\gamma = \min_{x\in\mathcal{O}_{K_{i_0+1}}}\big(v_{K_{i_0+1}}(g(x)-x)\big)$ decreases by at least 1 after adding generic p-th roots of each of the element in the p-basis.

Let z be a generator of $\mathcal{O}_{K_{i_0+1}}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{K_{i_0}}$. It satisfies an equation

$$z^p + a_1 z^{p-1} + \cdots + a_p = 0 \tag{3.1.4.1}$$

where $a_1, \dots, a_{p-1} \in \mathfrak{m}_{K_{i_0}}$ and $a_p \in \mathcal{O}_{K_{i_0}}^\times$ with $\bar{a}_p \in k_{i_0}^\times \backslash (k_{i_0}^\times)^p = k^\times \backslash (k^\times)^p$. It is easy to see that $\gamma = v_{K_{i_0}}(g(z)-z)$.

Adding generic p-th roots of each of the element in the p-basis gives us a field $\widehat{K}$. Now, the field extension $\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}/\widehat{K}K_{i_0}$ is also generated by z as above. But we can write $a_p = \alpha^p + \beta$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0}}$ and $\beta \in \mathfrak{m}_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0}}$. Hence if we substitute $z' = z + \alpha$ into (3.1.4.1), we get $z'^p + a_1' z'^{p-1} + \cdots + a_p' = 0$, with $a_1', \dots, a_p' \in \mathfrak{m}_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0}}$. Hence, $v_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}}(z') > 0$. By assumption that the extension $\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}/\widehat{K}K_{i_0}$ has naïve ramification degree 1, $\pi_{K_{i_0}}$ is a uniformizer for $\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}$ and hence $z'/\pi_{K_{i_0}}$ lies in $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}}$. Thus,

$$\gamma' = \min_{x\in\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}}}\big(v_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}}(g(x)-x)\big) \leq v_{\widehat{K}K_{i_0+1}}\big(g(z'/\pi_{K_{i_0}}) - z'/\pi_{K_{i_0}}\big) = v_{K_{i_0+1}}\big(g(z)-z\big) - 1 = \gamma - 1.$$

This proves the claim. However, the number γ is always a non-negative integer; this leads to a contradiction. Hence after finitely many operations of adding p-th roots, K_{i_0+1}/K_{i_0} has naïve ramification degree p. This finishes the proof. □

Remark 3.1.5. It is worth to point out that, after these operations, the number of elements in the p-basis of the resulting field will be more than that of the original field.

Proposition 3.1.6. *Fix $\beta_K \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$. If the highest non-logarithmic ramification break for any extension L/K satisfying Hypothesis 2.1.2 and for which the absolute ramification degree of K is β_K, is invariant under the operation of adding a generic p-th root, then for all such K*

(1) $\mathrm{Art}(\rho)$ is a non-negative integer for any continuous representation $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ with finite local monodromy;

(2) the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_K$ are trivial if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and are abelian groups killed by p if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>1}$.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 1.2.5(4), we may assume that k is separably closed and ρ is irreducible. In particular, ρ exactly factors through the Galois group of a totally ramified Galois extension L/K. We may also assume that k is imperfect and the extension is wildly ramified since the classical case and the tamely ramified case is well-known (Propositions 1.2.5(7) and 1.2.12). We need only to show that $\mathrm{Art}(\rho) = b(L/K) \cdot \dim \rho \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Now we reduce to the finite p-basis case. Choose a finite subset $J_0 \subset J$ such that $k(\bar{b}_j^{1/p})$ is linearly independent from l for any $j \in J \backslash J_0$. Define $K_1 = K\Big(b_j^{1/p^n}; j \in J\backslash J_0, n \in \mathbb{N}\Big)^\wedge$ and $L_1 = K_1 L$. It is easy to see that $[L_1 : K_1] = [L : K]$, $e_{L_1/K_1} \geq e_{L/K}$, and $[l_1 : k_1] \geq [l : k]$, where k_1 and l_1 are the residue fields of K_1 and L_1, respectively. Thus, all the inequalities are forced to be equalities. This implies $G_{L_1/K_1} = G_{L/K}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{L_1} = \mathcal{O}_L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K_1}$. By Proposition 1.2.5(4'), $b(L_1/K_1) = b(L/K)$. Therefore, we may reduce to the case when Hypothesis 2.1.2 holds.

Since adding generic p-th roots does not change β_K, the condition of this proposition says that $b(L/K)$ is invariant under the operation of adding generic p-th roots. By Proposition 3.1.4, we may assume that L/K is non-fiercely ramified as the base changes do not change the conductor. In this case, Proposition 1.2.5(4') implies that replacing K by $K\left(b_j^{1/p^n}; j \in J, n \in \mathbb{N}\right)^\wedge$ does not change the conductor. Hence, we reduce to the classical case; the statement follows from Proposition 1.2.12.

Now we prove (2), following the idea of [17, Theorem 3.5.13]. Let L be a finite Galois extension of K with Galois group $G_{L/K}$; then we obtain an induced filtration on $G_{L/K}$. It suffices to check that $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_{L/K}/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_{L/K}$ is abelian and killed by p; moreover, we may quotient further to reduce to the case where $\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_{L/K}$ is the trivial group but $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_{L/K}$ is not. As above, we may reduce to the classical case because the ramification break of any intermediate extension between L and K is also preserved under the operations above. The statement follows from Proposition 1.2.12. $\square$

3.2 Base change for generic p-th roots

In this subsection, we prove the key technical Theorem 3.2.5. We retain Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7.

Notation 3.2.1. For this subsection, Fix $j_0 \in J$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime to p. As in Definition 3.1.3, let $K(x)^\wedge$ be the completion of $K(x)$ with respect to the 1-Gauss norm and let K' be the completion of the maximal unramified extension of $K(x)^\wedge$. Let $\widetilde{K} = K'((b_{j_0} + x\pi_K^n)^{1/p})$ and $\widetilde{L} = L\widetilde{K}$. Denote $\beta_{j_0} = (b_{j_0} + x\pi_K^n)^{1/p}$ for simplicity. Denote the residue fields of $\widetilde{K}$ and $\widetilde{L}$ by $\tilde{k}$ and $\tilde{l}$, respectively.

Notation 3.2.2. From now on, we use ψ_K instead of ψ as we will consider the ψ-functions for different fields.

Notation 3.2.3. Denote $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}} = \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\llbracket \eta_0/\pi_K, \eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\rrbracket$. Applying Construction 2.2.1 to $\widetilde{K}$ gives a function $\psi_{\widetilde{K}} : \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \to \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}$, which is an approximate homomorphism modulo the ideal $I_{\widetilde{K}} = p(\eta_0/\pi_K, \eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}) \cdot \mathcal{R}_K$.

Lemma 3.2.4. *There exists a unique continuous $\mathcal{O}_K$-homomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{R}_K \to \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}$ such that $f^*(\delta_j) = \eta_j$ for $j \in J^+\backslash\{j_0\}$ and $f^*(\delta_{j_0}) = (\beta_{j_0} + \eta_{j_0})^p - (x + \eta_{m+1})(\pi_K + \eta_0)^n - b_{j_0}$. It gives an approximately commutative diagram modulo $I_{\widetilde{K}}$.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_K \arrow[r, "\psi_K"] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathcal{O}_K\llbracket \delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J\rrbracket = \mathcal{R}_K \arrow[d, "f^*"] \\
\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \arrow[r, "\psi_{\widetilde{K}}"] & \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\llbracket \eta_0/\pi_K, \eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\rrbracket = \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.2.4.1}$$

For $a > 1$, f^* gives a morphism $f : A_{\widetilde{K}}^{m+2}[0, \theta^a] \to A_K^{m+1}[0, \theta^a]$.

Proof. It follows immediately from Proposition 2.2.5. $\square$

Theorem 3.2.5. *Keep the notation as above and assume that $\beta_K \geq n + 1$. Let $a > 1$ and $\omega \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z} \cap [n+1, \beta_K]$. Let $TS^a_{L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda}$ be a recursive thickening space with error gauge $\geq \omega$. Then $TS^a_{L/K,\mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda} \times_{A_K^{m+1}[0,\theta^a],f} A_{\widetilde{K}}^{m+2}[0, \theta^a]$ is a recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with error gauge $\geq \omega - n$.*

The reader may skip this proof when reading the paper for the first time. Roughly speaking, the argument presented here is a more complicated version of Proposition 3.5.4.

Proof. **Step 1:** Cases of extension $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}/\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}$.

If $\bar{b}_{j_0}^{1/p} \notin l$, we have $\tilde{l} = \tilde{k}l$ and hence $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}} = \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_L$. Consequently, $\pi_{L,I}, \mathfrak{c}_\Lambda$ generate $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}/\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}$. In this case, $\mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}$ constructed in Definition 2.6.2 is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{S}_K \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_K, f^*} \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{S}_K\big/\big(\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I},\ \psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_K, f^*} \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}} \\ \simeq\ & \mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}\Big/\Big(f^*\big(\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}\big),\ f^*\big(\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big)\Big) \\ \simeq\ & \mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}\Big/\Big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + f^*\mathfrak{R}_{0,I} + \mathfrak{E}_{0,I},\ \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + f^*\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda + \mathfrak{E}_\Lambda\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.5.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{E}_{0,i} \in (\mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K - 1 + e_i/e}\eta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K + e_i/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}$ for $i \in I$ and $\mathfrak{E}_\lambda \in (\mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K - 1}\eta_0, \mathfrak{N}^{\beta_K}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}) \cdot \mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ are the error terms coming from the approximately commutative diagram (3.2.4.1). It is then clear that (3.2.5.1) gives a recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with error gauge $\geq \omega > \omega - n$.

From now on, we assume that $\bar{b}_{j_0}^{1/p} \in l$, which is the essential case. The difficulty comes from that $\pi_{L,I}, \mathfrak{c}_\Lambda$ do not generate $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}$ (although they do generate $\widetilde{L}$ over $\widetilde{K}$). Using the notation in Construction 2.6.1, Let λ_0 be the smallest λ such that $k_{\lambda+1} = k_\lambda(\bar{b}_{j_0}^{1/p})$. We need to change the generator $\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda_0}$ to an element which gives exactly one of the following two cases.

Case A: an inseparable extension $\tilde{l}/l(\bar{x})^{\mathrm{sep}}$ which happens when $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ has naïve ramification degree e;

Case B: a ramified extension of naïve ramification degree p which happens when $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ has naïve ramification degree ep.

Step 2: Find the generators of $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}/\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}$.

Denote $L' = LK'$, which has residue field $l' = l(\bar{x})^{\mathrm{sep}}$. Then, we have $\mathcal{O}_{L'} = \mathcal{O}_{K'} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_L$. Hence, $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_L \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{K'}} \mathcal{O}_{L'} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}$. We may extend the valuation $v_{L'}(\cdot)$ to $\widetilde{L}$ by allowing rational valuations in Case B. Let $\beta_{j_0} - \mu$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_{L'}$ be an element achieving the maximal valuation under $v_{L'}(\cdot)$ among $\beta_{j_0} + \mathcal{O}_{L'}$.

Claim: we have $\alpha = v_{L'}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu) \leq en/p$ and

in case A, the reduction of $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0} = \pi_L^{-\alpha}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu)$ in $\tilde{l}$ generates $\tilde{l}$ over l', in which case we set $d = 1$ for notational convenience;

in case B, $v_{L'}(\pi_L^{-[\alpha]}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu)) = d/p$ for some $d \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$, in which case we fix a d-th root $\pi_{\widetilde{L}, r_0+1}$ of $\pi_L^{-[\alpha]}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu)$, which generates the naïvely ramified extension $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}/\mathcal{O}_{L'}$.

Proof of the Claim: We have the norm $\mathbf{N}_{\widetilde{L}/L'}(\mu - \beta_{j_0}) = \mu^p - (b_{j_0} + x\pi_K^n)$. Since there is no $\mu \in \mathcal{O}_{L'}$ that can kill the $x\pi_K^n$ term (note $\beta_K \geq n+1$), $v_{L'}(\mathbf{N}_{\widetilde{L}/L'}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu)) \leq en$ and the first statement of the claim follows. When $\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$, we are forced to fall in Case B, and we can take dth root of $\pi_L^{-[\alpha]}(\beta_{j_0} - \mu)$ in $\widetilde{L}$ because the residue field $\tilde{l}$ is separably closed. The claim follows. Now consider the case $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume for contradiction that the reduction of $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0}$ lies in l'. Then there exists $\mu' \in \mathcal{O}_{L'}$ such that $\mu'/\pi_L^\alpha \equiv \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{\widetilde{L}}}$. But then $\beta_{j_0} - \mu - \mu'$ would have a bigger valuation, which contradicts our choice of μ. This proves the claim.

Step 3: Substitution.

By Lemma 2.6.8, we may assume that $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0} = \bar{\beta}_{j_0}$ in $\tilde{l}$. Thus, μ in Step 2 is congruent to $\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda_0}$ modulo the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{L'}$. In particular, if $\Delta : \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda \rangle/(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_L$ is the canonical isomorphism, we can write $\Delta^{-1}(\mu)$ using the basis (2.6.1.1) as $\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda_0} + \mathfrak{h}$ with $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{N}^{1/e} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda \rangle$.

We make a substitution $\chi : \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}^d\rangle[\![\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}]\!]$ by sending $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}$ to themselves but $\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda_0}$ to an element so that $\chi(\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda_0}) = \beta_{j_0} - \chi(\mathfrak{h}) - \mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}^{[\alpha]}\mathfrak{v}^d$. Then, χ induces an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}]\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_\Lambda\rangle / (\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}]\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}^d\rangle / \big(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}), \chi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)\big) \simeq \widetilde{L}. \tag{3.2.5.2}$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a$ be the ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}^d\rangle[\![\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}]\!]$ generated by $\chi(\mathfrak{N}^a)$, for $a \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. By Lemma 2.6.7, we may replace $\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda_0})$ on the right hand side of (3.2.5.2) by $\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}^{p[\alpha]}\mathfrak{q}$ for some $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}^d\rangle$ which is congruence to $\mathfrak{v}^{dp} - \mathfrak{z}$ modulo $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{1/e}$ for some $\mathfrak{z} \in \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}[\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}]$.

Let $\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}} = \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}^d\rangle[\![\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}]\!]$. Define the continuous $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}$-homomorphism $\tilde{\chi} : \mathfrak{S}_K \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_K, f^*} \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}} \to \mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}$ by sending $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$ to $\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}$, $\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}$ to $\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}$, and $\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda_0}$ to $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}\big(\chi(\mathfrak{u}_{\lambda_0})\big)$. It induces a natural homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A} \quad &:= \quad \mathfrak{S}_K / \big(\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{R}_{0,I}, \psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{R}_\Lambda\big) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_K, f^*} \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}} \\
&\simeq \quad \mathfrak{S}_K \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_K, f^*} \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}} / \big(f^*\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I}) + f^*(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}), f^*\psi_K(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda) + f^*(\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda)\big) \\
&\xrightarrow{\tilde{\chi}} \quad \mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}} / \big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{E}_{0,I}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda)) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_\Lambda) + \mathfrak{E}_\Lambda\big) =: \mathcal{A}',
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.5.3}$$

where $\mathfrak{E}_{0,i} \in \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\beta_K - 1 + e_{i-1}/e}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\beta_K + e_{i-1}/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}$ for $i \in I$ and $\mathfrak{E}_\Lambda \subset \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\beta_K - 1}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\beta_K}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}$ are the error terms coming from the approximate commutative diagram (3.2.4.1). Moreover, $\mathcal{A}'\big[\frac{1}{\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}}\big] = \mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}]$ is finite and free over $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}]$ with a basis given by

$$\Big\{\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}^{\mathfrak{e}_{0,I}}\mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}^{\mathfrak{e}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}}\mathfrak{v}^{d\mathfrak{e}_{\lambda_0}}\Big|\mathfrak{e}_{0,i} \in \{0, \dots, \frac{e_{i-1}}{e_i} - 1\} \text{ for all } i \in I \text{ and } \mathfrak{e}_\lambda \in \{0, \dots, p-1\} \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Lambda\Big\}. \tag{3.2.5.4}$$

Hence, (3.2.5.3) gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{A}[\frac{1}{p}] = \mathcal{A}\big[\frac{1}{\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}}\big] \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}'\big[\frac{1}{\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}}\big] = \mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}]$ because it is a surjective homomorphism between two free $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}]$-modules of same rank.

Step 4: We can simplify $\mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}]$ in (3.2.5.3) as in Lemma 2.6.8.

By Lemma 2.6.7, we may replace $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda_0})) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_{\lambda_0}) + \mathfrak{E}_{\lambda_0}$ in (3.2.5.3) by $\mathfrak{u}_{0,r_0}^{p[\alpha]}\big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\mathfrak{q}) + \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{q}}\big)$ with $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega - 1 - p[\alpha]/e}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega - p[\alpha]/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}] \simeq \mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}] \Big/ \Big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,I})) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_{0,I}) + \mathfrak{E}_{0,I}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}})) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}) + \mathfrak{E}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\mathfrak{q}) + \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{q}}\Big). \tag{3.2.5.5}$$

Now, We write $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_{0,i})) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_{0,i}) + \mathfrak{E}_{0,i} - \mathfrak{u}_{0,i}^{e_{i-1}/e_i}$ for $i \in I$, $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\chi(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)) + \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{R}_\lambda) + \mathfrak{E}_\lambda - \mathfrak{u}_\lambda^p$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}$, and $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\mathfrak{q}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ using the basis of (3.2.5.4). This amounts to modifying the above elements using equations in (3.2.5.5) with multiples in $\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}$. Hence, this will not decrease the error gauge. In other words, we may rewrite (3.2.5.5) as

$$\mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}] \simeq \mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}[\frac{1}{p}] \Big/ \Big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{0,I}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{0,I}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}\Big), \tag{3.2.5.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{0,i} &\in \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-1-p[\alpha]/e+e_{i-1}/e}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-p[\alpha]/e+e_{i-1}/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}} \text{ for } i \in I,\\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\lambda} &\in \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-1-p[\alpha]/e}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-p[\alpha]/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}} \text{ for } \lambda \in \Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\},\\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}} &\in \big(\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-1-p[\alpha]/e}\eta_0, \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{\omega-p[\alpha]/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\mathfrak{S}'_{\widetilde{K}}.\end{aligned}$$

If we are in Case A, $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{0,I}, \tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{q}}$ give the relation for the recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with generators $\pi_{L,I}, \mathfrak{c}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0}$. It is admissible with error gauge $\geq \omega - p\alpha/e \geq \omega - n$.

Step 5: In Case B, we need to take the "d-th root" of $\tilde{\mathfrak{v}}^d$.

If $d = 1$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{0,I}, \tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{q}}$ give the relation for the recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with generators $\pi_{L,I}, \mathfrak{c}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_{\lambda_0}$. It is admissible with error gauge $\geq \omega - p[\alpha]/e - 1/e \geq \omega - n$ (Since $\widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}$ now corresponds to a uniformizer, we have to take off an additional $1/e$ from the error gauge.)

If $d > 1$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}$ is not the right equation to generate $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}/\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}$. We will take a "$d$-th root" of $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}$. From Step 2, we can find $\mathfrak{d}_0 \in \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}\rangle$ such that $\Delta(\mathfrak{d}_0)^d \equiv \pi^p_{\widetilde{L},r_0+1} \bmod \pi^{p+1}_{\widetilde{L},r_0+1}$.

Define $\mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}} = \mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}\rangle[\![\mathfrak{u}_{0,I}]\!]$. For $a \in \frac{1}{e}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $\mathfrak{N}^a_{\widetilde{K}}$ be the ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}}\langle \mathfrak{u}_{0,I}, \mathfrak{u}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \mathfrak{v}\rangle$ defined for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ as in Construction 2.6.1.

We write $\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}$ as

$$\mathfrak{v}^{pd} - \mathfrak{d}_0^d + (\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) - \mathfrak{v}^{pd} + \mathfrak{d}_0^d + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}).$$

By Lemma 2.6.7, $\mathfrak{d}_0$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. We set $\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}'$ to be the sum of $\mathfrak{v}^p$ and

$$-\mathfrak{d}_0\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\binom{1/d}{n}\left(\frac{\mathfrak{v}^{pd} - \tilde{\mathfrak{q}} - \mathfrak{d}_0^d}{\mathfrak{d}_0^d}\right)^n$$

viewed as an element in $\mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}]$ and written in the standard basis (3.2.5.4). Also, we set $\widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}'_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}$ to be

$$\mathfrak{v}^p - \mathfrak{d}_0\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\binom{1/d}{n}\left(\frac{\mathfrak{v}^{pd} - \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) - \mathfrak{d}_0^d - \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}}{\mathfrak{d}_0^d}\right)^n - \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}');$$

it is an element in

$$\big(\mathfrak{N}_{\widetilde{K}}^{\omega-1-(p[\alpha]+d-1)/e}\eta_0, \mathfrak{N}_{\widetilde{K}}^{\omega-(p[\alpha]+d-1)/e}\eta_{J\cup\{m+1\}}\big)\cdot\mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\mathcal{A}'' = \mathfrak{S}_{\widetilde{K}}\Big/\Big(\psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{0,I}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{0,I}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}) + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Lambda\backslash\{\lambda_0\}}, \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}') + \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}'_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}\Big),$$

which is isomorphic to a recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with error gauge $\geq \omega-(p[\alpha]+d-1)/e \geq \omega - n$, by a similar simplification argument in Step 4.

We have a natural homomorphism $\mathcal{A}' \to \mathcal{A}''$. Conversely, let $d' \in \{2, \cdots, p-1\}$ such that $dd' = 1 + Dp$ for some $D \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{v} = \frac{\mathfrak{v}^{dd'}}{\mathfrak{v}^{Dp}} = \mathfrak{v}^{dd'}\mathfrak{d}_0^{-D}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\binom{-D/d}{n}\left(\frac{\mathfrak{v}^{pd} - \psi_{\widetilde{K}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}) - \mathfrak{d}_0^d - \widetilde{\mathfrak{R}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}}{\mathfrak{d}_0^d}\right)^n. \tag{3.2.5.7}$$

Recursively substituting $\mathfrak{v}$ back into (3.2.5.7), we recover $\mathfrak{v}$ from $\mathfrak{v}^d$. Thus the homomorphism $\mathcal{A}'[\frac{1}{p}] \to \mathcal{A}''[\frac{1}{p}]$ is surjective between two finite free $\mathcal{R}_{\widetilde{K}}$-modules of the same rank. Hence it is an isomorphism. The theorem is proved. $\square$

Remark 3.2.6. We expect that when ω and hence β_K is "large" compared to $[L : K]$, Theorem 3.2.5 is also valid if we add a generic p^∞-th root (defined in [21, Definition 5.2.2]); this amounts to control the discrepancy between $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{L}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_L$. Hence, in this case, one would be able to obtain a comparison theorem between the arithmetic Artin conductor and Borger's Artin conductor [6] as in [21, Subsection 5.4].

3.3 Non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem

In this subsection, we apply Theorem 3.2.5 to obtain the Hasse-Arf Theorem for non-logarithmic ramification filtrations.

We assume Hypothesis 2.1.2 until stating the last theorem.

Notation 3.3.1. Keep the notation as in Construction 2.1.6. Fix $j_0 \in J$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\widetilde{K} = K'((b_{j_0} + x\pi_K^n)^{1/p})$ as in Notation 3.2.1. Denote $\beta_{j_0} = (b_{j_0} + x\pi_K^n)^{1/p}$ for simplicity.

Lemma 3.3.2. *Assume $p \nmid n$ and $\beta_K \geq n$. Let $a_{J^+} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $a_0 = a_{j_0} = a_{m+1} > \max\{\frac{n-1}{p-1}, 1\}$. Define $a'_j = a_j$ for $j \in J^+ \backslash \{j_0\}$ and $a'_{j_0} = a_{j_0} + n - 1$. The morphism f^* defined in Lemma 3.2.4 restricts to a morphism*

$$f : A^1_{\widetilde{K}}[\theta^{a_0}, \theta^{a_0}] \times \cdots \times A^1_{\widetilde{K}}[\theta^{a_{m+1}}, \theta^{a_{m+1}}] \to A^1_K[\theta^{a'_0}, \theta^{a'_0}] \times \cdots \times A^1_K[\theta^{a'_m}, \theta^{a'_m}].$$

In other words, we change the j_0-th radius from a_{j_0} to $a_{j_0} + n - 1$.

Proof. It suffices to verify that if $|\eta_0| = |\eta_{j_0}| = |\eta_{m+1}| = \theta^{a_0}$, then $|\delta_{j_0}| = \theta^{a_0+n-1}$; indeed

$$\delta_{j_0} = \big((\beta_{j_0} + \eta_{j_0})^p - \beta_{j_0}^p\big) - x\big((\pi_K + \eta_0)^n - \pi_K^n\big) + \eta_{m+1}(\pi_K + \eta_0)^n,$$

which has norm θ^{a_0+n-1} because the second term does and other terms have bigger norms. $\square$

Lemma 3.3.3. *Keep the notation as in the previous lemma. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a differential module over $A^1_K[0, \theta^{a'_0}] \times \cdots \times A^1_K[0, \theta^{a'_m}]$, then $IR(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+}) = IR(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+ \cup \{m+1\}})$.*

Proof. The morphism f^* induces a homomorphism on differentials: $d\delta_j \mapsto d\eta_j$ for $j \in J^+ \backslash \{j_0\}$ and $d\delta_{j_0} \mapsto p(\beta_{j_0} + \eta_{j_0})^{p-1} d\eta_{j_0} + (\pi_K + \eta_0)^n d\eta_{m+1} + n(x + \eta_{m+1})(\pi_K + \eta_0)^{n-1} d\eta_0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial'_j|_{f^*\mathcal{E}} &= \partial_j|_{\mathcal{E}}, \quad j \in J\backslash\{j_0\}, \\
\partial'_{j_0}|_{f^*\mathcal{E}} &= p(\beta_{j_0} + \eta_{j_0})^{p-1} \partial_{j_0}|_{\mathcal{E}}, \\
\partial'_{m+1}|_{f^*\mathcal{E}} &= (\pi_K + \eta_0)^n \cdot \partial_{j_0}|_{\mathcal{E}}, \\
\partial'_0|_{f^*\mathcal{E}} &= \partial_0|_{\mathcal{E}} + n(x + \eta_{m+1})(\pi_K + \eta_0)^{n-1} \cdot \partial_{j_0}|_{\mathcal{E}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial'_j = \partial/\partial\eta_j$ for $j = 0, \ldots, m+1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
IR_j(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+ \cup \{m+1\}}) &= IR_j(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+}) \quad \forall j \in J\backslash\{j_0\}, \\
IR_{j_0}(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+ \cup \{m+1\}}) &\leq IR_{j_0}(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+}), \\
IR_{m+1}(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+ \cup \{m+1\}}) &= \theta^n \cdot IR_{j_0}(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+}), \\
IR_0(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+ \cup \{m+1\}}) &= \min\big\{IR_0(\mathcal{E}, a'_{J^+}), IR_{j_0}(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+})\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 1.1.19 and the last equality holds by Proposition 1.1.17 since x is transcendental over K. It follows that $IR(\mathcal{E}; a'_{J^+}) = IR(f^*\mathcal{E}; a_{J^+\cup\{m+1\}})$. $\square$

Theorem 3.3.4. *Let L/K be a finite Galois extension satisfying Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7. The highest non-logarithmic ramification break of L/K is invariant under the operation of adding a generic p-th root.*

Proof. Adding a generic p-th root corresponds to setting $n = 1$ in the notation in this subsection. Fix a choice of ψ_K in Construction 2.2.1. Let $TS^a_{L/K,\psi_K}$ be the standard thickening space for L/K. By Example 2.6.4, we can turn this standard thickening space into a recursive thickening space (with error gauge $\geq \beta_K$). By Theorem 3.2.5, $TS^a_{L/K,\psi_K} \times_{A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^a],f} A^{m+2}_{\widetilde{K}}[0,\theta^a]$ is a recursive thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ with error gauge $\geq \beta_K - 1$, which is isomorphic to some thickening space for $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$ by Proposition 2.6.5.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the differential module over $A^{m+1}_K[0,\theta^a]$ coming from $TS^a_{L/K,\psi_K}$. Then the differential module $f^*\mathcal{E}$ is associated to $\widetilde{L}/\widetilde{K}$. Applying Lemma 3.3.3 (to the case $n = 1$) gives $IR(f^*\mathcal{E}; \underline{s}) = IR(\mathcal{E}; \underline{s})$ for $s \geq b(L/K) - \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ as in Theorem 2.4.2. The theorem follows from Proposition 2.5.2. $\square$

Combining Theorem 3.3.4 and Proposition 3.1.6, we have the following.

Theorem 3.3.5. *Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$ which is not absolutely unramified. Let $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ be a representation with finite local monodromy. Then,*

(1) $\mathrm{Art}(\rho)$ is a non-negative integer;

(2) the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+} G_K$ are trivial if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and are abelian groups killed by p if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>1}$.

3.4 Application to finite flat group schemes

This subsection is an analogue of [21, Section 4.1] in the mixed characteristic case.

We first recall the definition [1] of ramification filtration on finite flat group schemes.

Convention 3.4.1. All finite flat group schemes are commutative.

Definition 3.4.2. Let A be a finite flat $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra. Write $A = \mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/\mathcal{I}$ with $\mathcal{I}$ an ideal generated by $f_1, \ldots, f_r$. For $a \geq 0$, define the rigid space

$$X^a = \big\{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in A^n_K[0,1] \big| |f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n)| \leq \theta^a,\ i = 1, \ldots, r\big\}.$$

The *highest break* $b(A/\mathcal{O}_K)$ of A is the smallest number such that for all rational number $a > b(A/\mathcal{O}_K)$, $\#\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(X^a) = \mathrm{rank}_{\mathcal{O}_K} A$. This is the same as Definition 1.2.3 if $A = \mathcal{O}_L$; but in notation, we use the ring of integers instead of fields themselves.

Definition 3.4.3. Now we specialize to the case when $G = \operatorname{Spec} A$ is a finite flat group scheme. We have a natural map of points $G(K^{\mathrm{alg}}) \hookrightarrow X^a(K^{\mathrm{alg}})$. Further composing with the map for geometrically connected components, we obtain

$$\sigma^a : G(K^{\mathrm{alg}}) \hookrightarrow X^a(K^{\mathrm{alg}}) \to \pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(X^a).$$

One can show that $\pi_0^{\mathrm{geom}}(X^a)$ has a natural group structure and σ^a is a homomorphism. Define G^a to be the Zariski closure of $\ker \sigma^a$.

Lemma 3.4.4. [1, Lemme 2.1.5] *Let K'/K be a (not necessarily finite) extension of complete discretely valued fields of naïve ramification index e. Let A be a finite flat $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra which is a complete intersection relative to $\mathcal{O}_K$. Put $A' = A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K'}$; then $b(A'/\mathcal{O}_{K'}) = e \cdot b(A/\mathcal{O}_K)$.*

Definition 3.4.5. We say that the finite flat group scheme G is *generically trivial* if $G \times_{\mathcal{O}_k} K$ is disjoint union of copies of $\operatorname{Spec} K$, with some abelian group structure.

Theorem 3.4.6. *Let $G = \operatorname{Spec} A$ be a generically trivial finite flat group scheme over $\mathcal{O}_K$. Then $b(A/\mathcal{O}_K)$ is a non-negative integer.*

Proof. Let $\gcd(n_1, n_2) = 1$ and let K_{n_1} and K_{n_2} be two tamely ramified extensions of K with ramification degree n_1 and n_2, respectively. By Lemma 3.4.4, it suffices to prove the theorem for $G \times_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K_{n_1}}/\mathcal{O}_{K_{n_1}}$ and $G \times_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K_{n_2}}/\mathcal{O}_{K_{n_2}}$, respectively. Thus, we may assume that $\beta_K \geq 2$. The theorem follows from Theorem 3.3.5 and the same argument as in [21, Proposition 5.1.7]. $\square$

3.5 Integrality for Swan conductors

In this subsection, we will deduce the integrality of Swan conductors from that of Artin conductors (Theorem 3.3.5). We will use the fact that the logarithmic ramification breaks behave well under tame base changes.

We will keep Hypothesis 2.1.2 until we state Theorem 3.5.11.

Notation 3.5.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \equiv 1 (\bmod\ ep)$. Define $K_n = K(\pi_K^{1/n})$ and $L_n = LK_n$. Since K_n and L are linearly independent over K, $\operatorname{Gal}(L_n/K_n) = \operatorname{Gal}(L/K)$. We take the uniformizer of K_n and L_n to be $\pi_{K_n} = \pi_K^{1/n}$ and $\pi_{L_n} = \pi_L/\pi_{K_n}^{(n-1)/e}$, respectively.

Notation 3.5.2. Denote $\mathcal{R}_{K_n} = \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!]$. Applying Construction 2.2.1 to K_n gives an approximate homomorphism $\psi_{K_n} : \mathcal{O}_{K_n} \to \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!]$.

Lemma 3.5.3. *There exists a unique continuous $\mathcal{O}_K$-homomorphism $f_n^* : \mathcal{R}_K \to \mathcal{R}_{K_n}$ sending δ_0 to $(\pi_{K_n} + \eta_0)^n - \pi_K$ and δ_j to η_j for $j \in J$. This gives an approximately commutative diagram modulo $I_{K_n} = p(\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J) \cdot \mathcal{R}_{K_n}$:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_K \arrow[r, "\psi_K"] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!] \arrow[d, "f_n^*"] \\
\mathcal{O}_{K_n} \arrow[r, "\psi_{K_n}"] & \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. Follows from Proposition 2.2.5. $\square$

Proposition 3.5.4. *Fix $a > 0$. Let $TS^a_{L/K,\log,\psi_K}$ be the standard logarithmic thickening space. Then the space*

$$X = TS^a_{L/K,\log,\psi_K} \times_{(A^1_K[0,\theta^{a+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^a]), f_n} \left(A^1_{K_n}[0, \theta^{a+1/n}] \times A^m_{K_n}[0, \theta^a]\right)$$

is a logarithmic thickening space for L_n/K_n with error gauge $\geq n\beta_K - (n-1)$; in particular, it is admissible.

Proof. First, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_K \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} K_n \cong \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!][\frac{1}{p}]\langle u_{J^+}\rangle / \big(f_n^*(\psi_K(p_{J^+}))\big).$$

Now we consider a construction of the logarithmic thickening space of L_n/K_n, using the same c_J for a p-basis of L_n and π_{L_n} in Notation 3.5.1 for a uniformizer of L_n. Therefore, the ideal $\mathcal{I}_{L_n/K_n}$ is generated by p'_{J^+} and $p'_0/\pi_{K_n}^{n-1}$, where the prime means to substitute u_0 by $\pi_{K_n}^{(n-1)/e}u'_0$.

Lemma 3.5.3 implies that

$$\psi_{K_n}(p'_0/\pi_{K_n}^{n-1}) - f_n^*(\psi_K(p'_0))/(\pi_{K_n}+\eta_0)^{n-1} \in \pi_{K_n}^{-n+1}(\pi_{K_n}^{n\beta_K-1}\eta_0, p\eta_J)\cdot \mathcal{S}_{K_n}, \tag{3.5.4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{K_n} = \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!]\langle u'_0, u_J\rangle$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_K \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} K_n &\cong \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!][\frac{1}{p}]\langle u'_0, u_J\rangle / \big(f_n^*(\psi_K(p'_0)), f_n^*(\psi_K(p'_J))\big) \\ &= \mathcal{S}_{K_n}[\frac{1}{p}] / \big(f_n^*(\psi_K(p'_0))/(\pi_{K_n}+\eta_0)^{n-1}, f_n^*(\psi_K(p'_J))\big)\end{aligned}$$

gives rise to logarithmic thickening spaces for L_n/K_n with error gauge $\geq n\beta_K - (n-1)$; note that the tame ramification of degree n results in a different normalization on error gauge. ☐

Proposition 3.5.5. *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_{L/K} \in [0,1]$ such that, for all integers $n > N$ congruent to* 1 *modulo ep, we have*

$$n \cdot b_{\log}(L/K) = b(L_n/K_n) - \alpha_{L/K}.$$

Proof. By Construction 1.1.16, f_n^* gives a finite étale morphism $f_n : A^1_{K_n}[0, \theta^{1/n}) \times A^m_{K_n}[0,1) \to A^1_K[0,\theta) \times A^m_K[0,1)$ for $a > 0$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ denote the differential module associated to L/K coming from a standard logarithmic thickening space. By Proposition 3.5.4, $f_n^*\mathcal{E}$ is a differential module associated to L_n/K_n. In particular,

$$ET_{L_n/K_n} \supseteq ET_{L/K} \times_{A^1_K[0,\theta)\times A^m_K[0,1), f_n} A^1_{K_n}[0,\theta^{1/n}) \times A^m_{K_n}[0,1) =: f_n^*(ET_{L/K})$$

The morphism f_n is an off-centered tame base change, as discussed in Subsection 1.1. By Proposition 1.1.17, for $s_{J^+} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $A^1_K[0,\theta^{s_0}] \times \cdots \times A^1_K[0,\theta^{s_m}] \subset ET_{L/K}$, we have $IR(f_n^*\mathcal{E}; s_{J^+}) = IR(\mathcal{E}; s_0 + \frac{n-1}{n}, s_J)$. Thus, by Corollary 2.5.3,

$$\begin{aligned}b(L_n/K_n) &= n\cdot \min\big\{s \mid A^{m+1}_{K_n}[0,\theta^s] \subseteq ET_{L_n/K_n} \text{ and } IR(f_n^*\mathcal{E}; \underline{s}) = 1\big\} \\ &= n\cdot \min\big\{s \mid A^{m+1}_{K_n}[0,\theta^s] \subseteq f_n^*(ET_{L/K}) \text{ and } IR(f_n^*\mathcal{E}; \underline{s}) = 1\big\} \\ &= n\cdot \min\big\{s \mid A^1_K[0,\theta^{s+(n-1)/n}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^s] \subseteq ET_{L/K} \text{ and } IR(\mathcal{E}; s+(n-1)/n, \underline{s}) = 1\big\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.5.5.1}$$

where the second equality holds because we will see in a moment that the minimal of s can be achieved inside $f_n^*ET_{L/K}$, if n is sufficiently large.

Applying Proposition 1.1.23(c) to $\mathcal{E}$, we know the locus $Z(\mathcal{E}) = \{(s_{J^+}) | IR(\mathcal{E}; s_{J^+}) = 1\}$ is transrational polyhedral in a neighborhood of $[b_{\log}(L/K), +\infty)^{m+1}$, namely, where $\mathcal{E}$ is defined.

Hence, in a neighborhood of $s_1 = b_{\log}(L/K)$, the intersection of the boundary of Z with the surface defined by $s_1 = \cdots = s_m$ is of the form

$$s_0 - \alpha' s_1 = b_{\log}(L/K) + 1 - \alpha' b_{\log}(L/K),$$

where α' is the slope; $\alpha' \in [-\infty, 0]$ by the monotonicity Proposition 1.1.23(c). When $n \gg 0$, it is clear that the line $s \mapsto (s + \frac{n-1}{n}, s, \dots, s)$ hits the boundary of Z at $s = b_{\log}(L/K) + 1/(n(1-\alpha'))$. This justifies the equality in (3.5.5.1). It follows that

$$b(L_n/K_n) = n \cdot b_{\log}(L/K) + 1/(1-\alpha');$$

the different normalizations for ramification filtrations on G_K and G_{K_n} give the extra factor n. $\square$

Remark 3.5.6. With more careful calculation, one may prove the above proposition and Proposition 3.5.9 below for any n sufficiently large and coprime to p.

Notation 3.5.7. Assume $p > 2$. Let (b_J) be a p-basis of K; it naturally gives a p-basis of K_n. Let $K_n(x_J)^\wedge$ denote the completion of $K_n(x_J)$ with respect to the $(1, \dots, 1)$-Gauss norm, and let K'_n denote the completion of the maximal unramified extension of $K_n(x_J)^\wedge$. Set

$$\widetilde{K}_n = K'_n\big((b_J + x_J \pi_{K_n}^2)^{1/p}\big), \quad \widetilde{L}_n = \widetilde{K}_n L.$$

Denote $\beta_j = (b_j + x_j \pi_{K_n}^2)^{1/p}$ for $j \in J$. By Lemma 3.2.4, we have a continuous $\mathcal{O}_{K_n}$-homomorphism $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\![\eta_0/\pi_{K_n}, \eta_J]\!] \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}_n}[\![\xi_0/\pi_{K_n}, \xi_J, \xi'_J]\!]$ such that $\tilde{f}^*(\eta_0) = \xi_0$ and $\tilde{f}^*(\eta_j) = (\beta_j + \xi_j)^p - (x_j + \xi'_j)(\pi_{K_n} + \xi_0)^2 - b_j$ for $j \in J$. For $a > 1$, it gives rise to $\tilde{f} : A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_n}[0, \theta^a] \to A^{m+1}_{K_n}[0, \theta^a] \hookrightarrow A^1_{K_n}[0, \theta^a] \times A^m_{K_n}[0, \theta^{a-1/n}]$, where the last morphism is the natural inclusion of affinoid subdomain.

Proposition 3.5.8. *Assume $p > 2$, $\beta_K \geq \frac{2m+n}{n}$, and $a > 1$. Let X be as in Proposition 3.5.4. Then the space*

$$X \times_{(A^1_{K_n}[0,\theta^{a+1/n}] \times A^m_{K_n}[0,\theta^a]), \tilde{f}} A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_n}[0, \theta^{a+1/n}]$$

is a thickening space for $\widetilde{L}_n/\widetilde{K}_n$ with error gauge $\geq n\beta_K - 2m - n + 1$; in particular, it is admissible.

Proof. It immediately follows from Proposition 3.5.5 and applying Theorem 3.2.5 m times. $\square$

Proposition 3.5.9. *Assume $p > 2$ and $\beta_K \geq 2$. There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all integers $n > N$ congruent to* 1 *modulo ep, we have*

$$n \cdot b_{\log}(L/K) - 1 = b(\widetilde{L}_n/\widetilde{K}_n) - 2\alpha_{L/K}, \tag{3.5.9.1}$$

where $\alpha_{L/K}$ is the same *as in Proposition 3.5.5.*

Proof. We continue with the notation from Proposition 3.5.5. Previous proposition implies that $\tilde{f}^* f_n^* \mathcal{E}$ is a differential module associated to $\widetilde{L}_n/\widetilde{K}_n$ when $n > m$. By applying Lemma 3.3.3 m times, we have $IR(\tilde{f}^* f_n^* \mathcal{E}; \underline{s}) = IR(f_n^* \mathcal{E}; s, \underline{s + \frac{1}{n}})$. By Proposition 1.1.17, it further equals $IR(\mathcal{E}; s + \frac{n-1}{n}, \underline{s + \frac{1}{n}})$. By the same argument as in Theorem 3.5.5, we deduce our result with the same $\alpha_{L/K}$. $\square$

Remark 3.5.10. When $p = 2$, we study $\widetilde{K}_n = K'_n\big((b_J + x_J\pi_{K_n}^3)^{1/p}\big)$ instead; the same argument above proves the proposition with (3.5.9.1) replaced by

$$n \cdot b_{\log}(L/K) - 2 = b(L_n/K_n) - 3\alpha_{L/K}.$$

For the following theorem, we do not impose any hypothesis on K.

Theorem 3.5.11. *Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ and let $\rho : G_K \to GL(V_\rho)$ be a representation with finite local monodromy. Then* $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ *is a non-negative integer if $p \neq 2$ and is in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ if $p = 2$.*

Proof. First, as in the proof of Proposition 3.1.6, we may reduce to the case when ρ is irreducible and factors through a finite Galois extension L/K, for which Hypothesis 2.1.2 hold. In this case, $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) = b_{\log}(L/K) \cdot \dim \rho$.

By Proposition 1.2.5(4), we have $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho|_{K_n}) = n \cdot \mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ for any $K_n = K(\pi_K^{1/n})$ with $\gcd(n, ep) = 1$. We need only to prove $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho|_{K_n}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for two coprime n's satisfying $\gcd(n, ep) = 1$, and the statement for $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ will follow immediately. In particular, we may assume that $\beta_K \geq 2$.

When $p > 2$, we use similar argument as above. There exist n_1, n_2 satisfying the condition of Propositions 3.5.5 and 3.5.9 and $\gcd(n_1, n_2) = 1$. Thus, by the non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf Theorem 3.3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} &n_1\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) + \alpha_{L/K} \dim \rho \in \mathbb{Z}, &\quad &n_1\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) + 2\alpha_{L/K} \dim \rho \in \mathbb{Z};\\ &n_2\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) + \alpha_{L/K} \dim \rho \in \mathbb{Z}, &\quad &n_2\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) + 2\alpha_{L/K} \dim \rho \in \mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies immediately that $n_1\mathrm{Swan}(\rho), n_2\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \in \mathbb{Z}$; hence, $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

When $p = 2$, a similar argument using Remark 3.5.10 gives $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho) \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. ☐

Remark 3.5.12. When $p = 2$, we expect the integrality of Swan conductors in the case K is the composition of a discrete completely valued field with perfect residue field and an absolutely unramified complete discrete valuation field. In this case, we can factor ψ_K as $\mathcal{O}_K \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K]\!] \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!]$ with the second map a *homomorphism*. This fact may allow us to show that $\alpha_{L/K}$ is either 0 or 1 depending on whether ∂_0 dominates.

We do not know if $\mathrm{Swan}(\rho)$ when $p = 2$ in general.

3.6 An example of wildly ramified base change

In this subsection, we explicitly calculate an example, which we will use in the next subsection. This example was first introduced in [17, Proposition 2.7.11]. We retain Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7.

Lemma 3.6.1. *Let K_* be the finite extension of K generated by a root of*

$$T^p + \pi_K T^{p-1} = \pi_K. \tag{3.6.1.1}$$

Then K_* is Galois over K. Moreover the logarithmic ramification break $b_{\log}(K_*/K) = 1$.

Proof. Let $h(T) = T^p - \pi_K T^{p-1} - \pi_K$ and ϖ a root of h. It is clear that ϖ is a uniformizer of K_*.

$$\begin{aligned}
h(\varpi + T) &= (\varpi + T)^p + \pi_K(\varpi + T)^{p-1} - \pi_K \\
&= T^p + p\big(\varpi T^{p-1} + \cdots + \varpi^{p-1}T\big) + \pi_K\big(T^{p-1} + (p-1)\varpi T^{p-2} + \cdots + (p-1)\varpi^{p-2}T\big), \\
h(\varpi + \varpi^2 T) &= \varpi^{2p}T^p + \pi_K\big(\varpi^{2p-2}T^{p-1} + (p-1)\varpi^{2p-1}T^{p-2} + \cdots + (p-1)\varpi^{p}T\big) \\
&\quad + p\big(\varpi^{2p-1}T^{p-1} + \cdots + \varpi^{p+1}T\big) \\
&= \pi_K^2\big((1-\varpi^{p-1})^2T^p + \varpi^{p-2}(1-\varpi^{p-1})T^{p-1} + \cdots + (p-1)(1-\varpi^{p-1})T\big) \\
&\quad + p\pi_K(1-\varpi^{p-1})\big(\varpi^{p-1}T^{p-1} + \cdots + \varpi T\big).
\end{aligned}$$

We see that $h(\varpi + \varpi^2 T)/\pi_K^2$ is congruent to $T^p - T$ modulo ϖ. By Hensel's lemma, it splits completely in K_*. Hence, K_*/K is Galois. Moreover, the valuation of the difference between two distinct roots is 2. This implies that $b_{\log}(K_*/K) = 1$. ☐

Notation 3.6.2. Denote the roots of $h(T) = T^p + \pi_K T^{p-1} - \pi_K$ by $\varpi = \varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_p$.

For $a > 0$, the standard logarithmic thickening space $TS^a_{K_*/K,\log,\psi_K}$ for K_*/K is given by

$$\mathcal{O}^{a+1}_{TS,K_*/K,\log,\psi_K} = K\langle \pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_J, z\rangle \big/ \big(z^p + (\pi_K + \delta_0)z^{p-1} - (\pi_K + \delta_0)\big).$$

Lemma 3.6.3. *Assume $a > 1$. The standard logarithmic thickening space $TS^a_{K_*/K,\log,\psi_K} \times_K K_*$ is isomorphic to the product of $A^m_{K_*}[0, \theta^a]$ with the disjoint union of p discs $|z - \varpi_\gamma| \leq \theta^{a-(p-2)/p}$ for $\gamma = 1, \dots, p$.*

Proof. We can rewrite $z^p + (\pi_K + \delta_0)z^{p-1} - (\pi_K + \delta_0)$ as

$$\prod_{\gamma=1}^{p} \big(z - \varpi_\gamma\big) = \delta_0(1 - z^{p-1}). \qquad (3.6.3.1)$$

Since $|z| \leq 1$, the right hand side of (3.6.3.1) has norm $\leq \theta^{a+1} < \theta^2$. On the left hand side, for $\gamma \neq \gamma' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $|\varpi_\gamma - \varpi_{\gamma'}| = \theta^{2/p}$. This forces $|z - \varpi_{\gamma_0}|$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ to be strictly smaller than the others. Thus, $|z - \varpi_{\gamma_0}| = |\delta_0|/(\theta^{2/p})^{p-1} = \theta^{a-(p-2)/p}$. ☐

Notation 3.6.4. For $\gamma = 1, \dots, p$, we define the $\mathcal{O}_K$-homomorphism $f^*_\gamma : \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K]\!] \to \mathcal{O}_{K_*}[\![\eta_0/\varpi_\gamma]\!]$ by sending δ_0 to

$$\frac{(\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^p}{1 - (\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^{p-1}} - \pi_K = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big((\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^{p+n(p-1)} - \varpi_\gamma^{p+n(p-1)}\big). \qquad (3.6.4.1)$$

Lemma 3.6.5. *For $a > 1$, f^*_γ induces a K-morphism $f_\gamma : A^1_{K_*}[0, \theta^{a-(p-2)/p}] \to A^1_K[0, \theta^{a+1}]$, which is an isomorphism when we tensor the target with K_* over K. Moreover, if we use F_{a+1} and $F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}$ to denote the completion of $K(\delta_0)$ and $K_*(\eta_0)$ with respect to the θ^{a+1}-Gauss norm and $\theta^{a+(p-2)/p}$-Gauss norm, respectively, then f^*_γ extends to a homomorphism $F_{a+1} \to F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}$.*

Proof. The statement follows from the fact that the leading term in (3.6.4.1) is $(2p-1)\varpi_\gamma^{2p-2}\eta_0$. ☐

Proposition 3.6.6. *Assume $a > 1$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a differential module over $A^1_K[0, \theta^{a+1}]$. For each $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, this gives a differential module $f^*_\gamma\mathcal{E}$ over $A^1_{K_*}[0, \theta^{a-(p-2)/p}]$. Then we have*

$$IR_0(f^*_\gamma\mathcal{E}; a - (p-2)/p) = IR_0(\mathcal{E}; a+1).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to Proposition 1.1.17. By Lemma 3.6.5, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F_{a+1} \arrow[r, "f^*_{\mathrm{gen}}"] \arrow[d, "f^*_\gamma"] & F_{a+1}[\![\pi_K^{-a-1}T_0]\!]_0 \arrow[d, "f^*_\gamma"] \\
F^*_{a-(p-2)/p} \arrow[r, "f^*_{\mathrm{gen}}"] & F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}[\![\varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}T'_0]\!]_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where we extend f^*_γ by $f^*_\gamma(T_0) = \dfrac{(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^p}{1-(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^{p-1}} - \dfrac{(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^p}{1-(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{p-1}}$.

We claim that for $r \in [0,1)$, f^*_γ induces an isomorphism between

$$F^*_{a-(p-2)/p} \times_{f^*_\gamma, F_{a+1}} \big(A^1_{F_{a+1}}[0, r\theta^{a+1})\big) \simeq A^1_{F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}}[0, r\theta^{a-(p-2)/p}).$$

Indeed, if $|T'_0| < r\theta^{a-(p-2)/p}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0 &= \frac{(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^p}{1-(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^{p-1}} - \frac{(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^p}{1-(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{p-1}} \\
&= \big((\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^p - (\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^p\big) + \big((\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0+T'_0)^{2p-1} - (\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{2p-1}\big) + \cdots \\
&\in (2p-1)(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{2p-2}T'_0 + \big((\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{2p-1}T'_0, T'^p_0\big)\cdot \mathcal{O}_{K_*}\langle \varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}\eta_0\rangle[\![\varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}T'_0]\!]
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $|T_0| = \theta^{(2p-2)/p}\cdot|T'_0| < r\theta^a$.

Conversely, if $|T_0| < r\theta^a$, we rewrite the above equation as

$$T'_0 \in \frac{1}{(2p-1)(\varpi_\gamma+\eta_0)^{2p-2}}T_0 + (\varpi_\gamma T'_0)\cdot\mathcal{O}_{K_*}\langle\varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}\eta_0\rangle[\![\varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}T'_0]\!]. \tag{3.6.6.1}$$

We substitute (3.6.6.1) back into itself recursively. The equation converges to an expression of T'_0.

Therefore, Lemma 1.1.15 implies that for $r \in [0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& IR_0(\mathcal{E}; a+1) \le r \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & f^*_{\mathrm{gen}}(\mathcal{E}\otimes F_{a+1}) \text{ is trivial on } A^1_{F_{a+1}}[0, r\theta^{a+1}) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \tilde{f}^*_\gamma f^*_{\mathrm{gen}}(\mathcal{E}\otimes F_{a+1}) = f^*_{\mathrm{gen}}\big(f^*_\gamma\mathcal{E}\otimes F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}\big) \text{ is trivial on } A^1_{F^*_{a-(p-2)/p}}[0, r\theta^{a-(p-2)/p}) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & IR_0(f^*_\gamma\mathcal{E}; a-(p-2)/p) \le r.
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition follows. ☐

Construction 3.6.7. Fix a p-basis (b_J) of K; it naturally gives a p-basis of K_*. Fix a choice of $\psi_K : \mathcal{O}_K \to \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!]$ as in Construction 2.2.1. We will use the method in Construction 2.2.1 to define $\psi_{K_*,\gamma}$ for $\gamma = 1, \dots, p$ such that the following diagram *commutes.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_K \arrow[r, "\psi_K"] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathcal{O}_K[\![\delta_0/\pi_K, \delta_J]\!] \arrow[d, "f^*_\gamma"] \\
\mathcal{O}_{K_*} \arrow[r, "\psi_{K_*,\gamma}"] & \mathcal{O}_{K_*}[\![\eta_0/\varpi_\gamma, \delta_J]\!]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.6.7.1}$$

For any element $h \in \mathcal{O}_{K_*}$, first write $h = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} h_i \varpi_\gamma^i$ where $h_i \in \mathcal{O}_K$. As in Construction 2.2.1, write each of h_i as $h_i^\circ \pi_K^{e_i}$ for $e_i = v_K(h_i)$ and $h_i^\circ \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$; choose a compatible system of r-th p-basis decompositions of h_i° as

$$h_i^\circ = \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} b_J^{e_J} \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{i,(r),e_J,n}} \alpha_{i,(r),e_J,n,n'}^{p^r} \big) \pi_K^n \Big)$$

for some $\alpha_{i,(r),e_J,n,n'} \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times \cup \{0\}$ and some $\lambda_{i,(r),e_J,n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We take the system of r-th p-basis decompositions of $h/\varpi_\gamma^{v_{K_*}(h)}$ to be

$$\frac{h}{\varpi_\gamma^{v_{K_*}(h)}} = \frac{1}{\varpi_\gamma^{v_{K_*}(h)}} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \varpi_\gamma^i \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} b_J^{e_J} \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{i,(r),e_J,n}} \alpha_{i,(r),e_J,n,n'}^{p^r} \big) (\varpi_\gamma^{p-1} + \varpi_\gamma^{2p-1} + \cdots)^{n+i} \Big)$$

and define $\psi_{K_*,\gamma}(h)$ to be the limit

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} (\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^i \sum_{e_J=0}^{p^r-1} (b_J + \delta_J)^{e_J} \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{n'=0}^{\lambda_{i,(r),e_J,n}} \alpha_{i,(r),e_J,n,n'}^{p^r} \big) \big((\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^{p-1} + (\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^{2p-1} + \cdots \big)^{n+i} \Big).$$

This gives a $\psi_{K_*,\gamma}$ defined in the way of Construction 2.2.1. Moreover, the diagram (3.6.7.1) is commutative.

Hypothesis 3.6.8. For the rest of this subsection, let L/K_* be a finite Galois extension satisfying Hypotheses 2.1.2 and 2.2.7 and such that L/K is Galois.

Proposition 3.6.9. *Let $a > 1$. Then there exists admissible $(R_{J^+}) \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$ such that the logarithmic thickening space for L/K, after extension of scalars from K to K_*, is isomorphic to a disjoint union of p (different) standard logarithmic thickening spaces for L/K_*:*

$$TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}} \times_K K_* \xrightarrow{\sim} \coprod_{\gamma=1}^{p} TS^{pa-p+1}_{L/K_*,\log,\psi_{K_*,\gamma}}.$$

Proof. Write $\mathcal{O}_{K_*}\langle u_{J^+}\rangle/(p_{J^+}) = \mathcal{O}_L$ using Construction 2.1.6. Since $\mathcal{O}_K\langle z\rangle/(z^p + \pi_K z^{p-1} - \pi_K) = \mathcal{O}_{K_*}$, we may replace the coefficients in p_{J^+} by elements in $\mathcal{O}_K[z]$ with degree $\leq p-1$ in z, denoting the result polynomials by p'_{J^+}. Thus by Lemma 3.6.3 and the commutativity of (3.6.7.1),

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{\gamma=1}^{p} K_*\langle \varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-2}\eta_0, \varpi_\gamma^{-pa+p-1}\eta_J \rangle \langle u_{J^+}\rangle / (\psi_{K_*,\gamma}(p_{J^+})) \\ &\cong K_*\langle \pi_K^{-a-1}\delta_0, \pi_K^{-a}\delta_J \rangle \langle u_{J^+}, z\rangle \big/ \big(\psi_K(p'_{J^+}), z^p + (\pi_K + \delta_0) z^{p-1} - (\pi_K + \delta_0)\big), \end{aligned}$$

where the latter one is a recursive logarithmic thickening space for L/K, base changed to K_*. By Proposition 2.6.5, this recursive logarithmic thickening space is isomorphic to a logarithmic thickening space $TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$ for L/K for some admissible subset $R_{J^+} \subset (\delta_{J^+}) \cdot \mathcal{S}_K$. ☐

Corollary 3.6.10. *Let $\mathcal{E}_{L/K}$ be the differential module over $A^1_K[0,\theta^{a+1}] \times A^m_K[0,\theta^a]$ coming from $TS^a_{L/K,\log,R_{J^+}}$. For $\gamma \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, let $\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}$ be the differential module over $A^1_{K_*}[0,\theta^{a-(p-2)/p}] \times A^m_{K_*}[0,\theta^{a-(p-1)/p}]$ coming from $TS^{ap-p+1}_{L/K_*,\log,\psi_{K_*,\gamma}}$. Then $\mathcal{E}_{L/K} \otimes_K K_* \simeq \bigoplus_{\gamma=1}^{p} f_{\gamma *}\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.6.3 and Proposition 3.6.9. ☐

3.7 Subquotients of logarithmic ramification filtration

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 3.7.3 that the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log}G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log}G_K$ of the logarithmic ramification filtration are abelian groups killed by p if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and are trivial if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$. This uses the totally ramified base change discussed in previous subsection.

We assume Hypothesis 3.6.8 until we state the main Theorem 3.7.3.

Notation 3.7.1. Fix $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let (b_J) be a finite p-basis of K. It naturally gives a p-basis of K_*. Denote by $K(x_J)^\wedge$ the completion of $K(x_J)$ with respect to the $(1, \dots, 1)$-Gauss norm and by K' the completion of the maximal unramified extension of $K(x_J)^\wedge$. Write $K'_* = K_*K'$ and $L' = K'_*L$. Set

$$\widetilde{K}_\gamma = K'_*((b_J + x_J\varpi_\gamma^{p-1})^{1/p}).$$

Denote $\beta_J = (b_J + x_J\varpi_\gamma^{p-1})^{1/p}$ for simplicity. Take the uniformizer and p-basis of $\widetilde{K}_\gamma$ to be ϖ_γ and $\{\beta_J, x_J\}$, respectively.

Situation 3.7.2. We have the following diagram of field extensions:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
L \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L' \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & \widetilde{L}_\gamma \arrow[d, dash] \\
K_* \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & K'_* \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & \widetilde{K}_\gamma \\
K \arrow[r, dash] & K' &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that $(\widetilde{K}_\gamma)_{\gamma=1,\dots,p}$ are extensions of K'_* conjugate over K'. The ramification filtrations on $G_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}$ are compatible with the conjugation action of $\mathrm{Gal}(K'_*/K')$. More precisely, for any $b \geq 0$ and $g \in \mathrm{Gal}(K'_*/K')$, $g\mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log}G_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}g^{-1} = \mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log}G_{g(\widetilde{K}_\gamma)}$ and $g\mathrm{Fil}^bG_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}g^{-1} = \mathrm{Fil}^bG_{g(\widetilde{K}_\gamma)}$ inside $G_{K'}$. In particular, since L'/K' and hence $\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma$ are Galois, $b(\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma)$ and $b_{\log}(\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma)$ do not depend on $\gamma = 1, \dots, p$.

For the following theorem, we do not impose any hypothesis on the field K.

Theorem 3.7.3. *Let K be a complete discretely valued field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$. Let G_K be its Galois group. Then the subquotients $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log}G_K/\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log}G_K$ of the logarithmic ramification filtration are trivial if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and are abelian groups killed by p if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.*

Proof. We will proceed as in the proof of Theorem 3.3.5. Fix $a > 0$. Let L be a finite Galois extension of K with Galois group $G_{L/K}$ with an induced ramification filtration $\mathrm{Fil}^\bullet_{\log}G_{L/K}$. We may assume that $\mathrm{Fil}^{a+}_{\log}G_{L/K}$ is trivial but $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log}G_{L/K}$ is not. We may also assume Hypothesis 2.1.2. Furthermore, by Proposition 1.2.5(4), we are free to make a tame base change and assume that all logarithmic ramification breaks of L/K is strictly bigger than 1, and $p\beta_K \geq m(p-1)+1$. Finally, we may replace L by LK_* since $b_{\log}(K_*/K) = 1$ by Lemma 3.6.1, and hence Hypothesis 3.6.8 holds. We need to show that $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathrm{Fil}^a_{\log}G_{L/K}$ is an abelian group killed by p.

We claim that each of the logarithmic ramification breaks $b > 1$ of L/K will become a non-log ramification break $bp - p + 2$ on $\widetilde{L}_1/\widetilde{K}_1$. In other words, $\mathrm{Fil}^b_{\log}G_{L/K} \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^{pb-p+2}G_{\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma}$ for any

$\gamma \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $b > 1$. (It does not matter which γ we choose as they give the same answer by Situation 3.7.2.) Then the theorem is a direct consequence of the non-logarithmic Hasse-Arf theorem 3.3.5(2).

To prove the claim, it suffices to prove the highest ramification breaks as the others will follow from the calculation for other L's.

For each $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, there exists a unique continuous $\mathcal{O}_{K_*}[\![\eta_0/\varpi_\gamma]\!]$-homomorphism $\tilde{f}_\gamma^* : \mathcal{O}_{K_*}[\![\eta_0/\varpi_\gamma, \delta_J]\!] \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}[\![\eta_0/\varpi_\gamma, \eta_J, \eta'_J]\!]$ such that $\tilde{f}_\gamma^*\delta_j = (\beta_j + \eta_j)^p - (x_j + \eta'_j)(\varpi_\gamma + \eta_0)^{p-1} - b_j$ for $j \in J$. For $a > 1$, $\tilde{f}_\gamma^*$ gives a morphism $\tilde{f}_\gamma : A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}[0, \theta^a] \to A^{m+1}_{K_*}[0, \theta^a]$.

Let $TS^a_{L/K_*, \psi_{K_*,\gamma}}$ be the standard thickening space for L/K_* and $\psi_{K_*,\gamma}$. We have a Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & TS^a_{L/K_*, \psi_{K_*,\gamma}} \arrow[dl] \arrow[d, "\Pi"] & TS^a_{L/K_*, \psi_{K_*,\gamma}} \times_{A^{m+1}_{K_*}[0,\theta^a], \tilde{f}_\gamma} A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}[0, \theta^a] \arrow[l, "\tilde{f}_\gamma"'] \arrow[d, "\Pi"] \\
A^1_{K_*}[0, \theta^{a + \frac{2p-2}{p}}] \times A^m_{K_*}[0, \theta^a] & A^{m+1}_{K_*}[0, \theta^a] \arrow[l, "f_\gamma"'] & A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}[0, \theta^a] \arrow[l, "\tilde{f}_\gamma"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

By applying Theorem 3.2.5 m times, $TS^a_{L/K_*, \psi_{K_*,\gamma}} \times_{A^{m+1}_{K_*}[0,\theta^a], \tilde{f}_\gamma} A^{2m+1}_{\widetilde{K}_\gamma}[0, \theta^a]$ is an admissible recursive non-logarithmic thickening space (of error gauge $\geq p\beta_K - m(p-1) \geq 1$), which is isomorphic to an admissible non-logarithmic thickening space for $\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma$ by Proposition 2.6.5. Thus $\tilde{f}_\gamma^*\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}$ is a differential module associated to $\widetilde{L}_\gamma/\widetilde{K}_\gamma$.

By Proposition 3.6.6 and Lemma 3.3.3, we have

$$IR(\tilde{f}_\gamma^*\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}; \underline{s}) = IR\Big(\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}; s, \underline{s + \frac{p-2}{p}}\Big) = IR\Big((f_\gamma)_*\mathcal{E}_{L/K_*,\gamma}; s + \frac{2p-2}{p}, \underline{s + \frac{p-2}{p}}\Big).$$

The claim follows by Corollaries 3.6.10 and 2.5.3. □

References

[1] Ahmed Abbes and Abdellah Mokrane. Sous-groupes canoniques et cycles évanescents p-adiques pour les variétés abéliennes. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (99):117–162, 2004.

[2] Ahmed Abbes and Takeshi Saito. Ramification of local fields with imperfect residue fields. *Amer. J. Math.*, 124(5):879–920, 2002.

[3] Ahmed Abbes and Takeshi Saito. Ramification of local fields with imperfect residue fields, II. *Doc. Math.*, (Extra Vol.):5–72 (electronic), 2003. Kazuya Kato's fiftieth birthday.

[4] Yves André. Structure des connexions méromorphes formelles de plusieurs variables et semi-continuité de l'irrégularité. *Invent. Math.*, 170(1):147–198, 2007.

[5] Vladimir G. Berkovich. *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, volume 33 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[6] James M. Borger. Conductors and the moduli of residual perfection. *Math. Ann.*, 329(1):1–30, 2004.

[7] G. Christol and B. Dwork. Modules différentiels sur des couronnes. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 44(3):663–701, 1994.

[8] G. Christol and Z. Mebkhout. Sur le théorème de l'indice des équations différentielles p-adiques. III. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 151(2):385–457, 2000.

[9] Gilles Christol and Philippe Robba. *Équations différentielles p-adiques.* Actualités Mathématiques. Hermann, Paris, 1994. Applications aux sommes exponentielles.

[10] Shin Hattori. Ramification of a finite flat group scheme over a local field. *J. Number Theory*, 118(2):145–154, 2006.

[11] Shin Hattori. Tame characters and ramification of finite flat group schemes. *J. Number Theory*, 128(5):1091–1108, 2008.

[12] Kazuya Kato. Logarithmic structures of Fontaine-Illusie. In *Algebraic analysis, geometry, and number theory (Baltimore, MD, 1988)*, pages 191–224. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 1989.

[13] Kazuya Kato and Takeshi Saito. On the conductor formula of Bloch. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (100):5–151, 2004.

[14] Kiran S. Kedlaya. p-adic differential equations. `http://www-math.mit.edu/~kedlaya/papers/`.

[15] Kiran S. Kedlaya. Swan conductors for p-adic differential modules, II: Global Variation. arXiv: `math.NT/0705.0031v2`.

[16] Kiran S. Kedlaya. Local monodromy of p-adic differential equations: an overview. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 1(1):109–154, 2005.

[17] Kiran S. Kedlaya. Swan conductors for p-adic differential modules. I. A local construction. *Algebra Number Theory*, 1(3):269–300, 2007.

[18] Kiran S. Kedlaya and Liang Xiao. Differential modules on p-adic polyannuli. arXiv: `0804.1495v2`.

[19] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Local fields*, volume 67 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1979.

[20] Moss Eisenberg Sweedler. Structure of inseparable extensions. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 87:401–410, 1968.

[21] Liang Xiao. On ramification filtrations and p-adic differential equations, I: equal characteristic case. arXiv: `0801.4962v2`.